Irish physical education teacher education students and their professional learning: the teaching practice experience

Title

Irish Physical Education Teacher Education Students and their Professional Learning: The Teaching Practice Experience.

By

Ms. Fiona C. Chambers

A Doctoral Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy of Loughborough University

29th October 2008

Abstract

In Ireland, formal mentoring as a mechanism for supporting student learning in the Teaching Practice (TP) phase of Initial Teacher Education (ITE) is at a developmental stage. The Irish Government appears to support mentoring initiatives in ITE, however, there is little evidence of a clear policy on student teacher learning, and the role of mentoring within it.

This study investigates physical education teacher education (PETE) student learning on TP within a community of practice framework. Currently, the process of informal mentoring of PETE students during TP is undertaken by untrained cooperating teachers (CTs) as an unacknowledged gesture of goodwill. This has implications for the quality of PETE student learning during TP and became the subject of this research.

Employing a range of qualitative data collection methods, this study focused on one umbrella case study (Greendale University, schools and PETE students) and five individual case studies: tetrads of PETE student, CT, university tutor (UT) and school principal (SP) during one academic year. PETE student learning was investigated from the perspectives of each member of the tetrad and data collected were analysed using grounded theory.

Findings from this research concluded that (a) untrained CTs were unsuitable mentors and (b) untrained UTs were inappropriate tutors for PETE students as they both needed teaching expertise, a positive disposition and adequate training to embrace their respective roles. The study also found that within TP, there was a perceived lack of parity between the schools and university, with SPs feeling excluded and taken for granted by the university. This often led to open hostility between CTs and UTs, who were unclear about their respective TP roles. The combination of these factors resulted in PETE students learning the powerful hidden curriculum of TP which encouraged them to learn pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) in an unsupported and often isolated manner.

Keywords: Teaching Practice, learning, mentoring, Physical Education, hidden curriculum, school-university relationship.

Acknowledgements

I owe an immense debt of gratitude to my supervisor during this research, Professor Kathleen Armour. Her wisdom and guidance were invaluable as I navigated this process.

I am deeply appreciative of the help given to me by Dr. Jo Harris throughout this research.

I would also like to thank those who agreed to be interviewed, as without your time and commitment this research would not have been possible.

For their constant encouragement and belief in me, I thank my parents Maura and Michael.

I would especially like to thank my brother Ken for our considered debates and his incessant good humour and my sister Michèle for her support during this research.

I acknowledge my two former mentors: the late Michael Darmody and the late Jacinta O'Brien for continuing to be an inspiration to me.

I wish to express my gratitude to my peers for their continued intellectual stimulation and friendship, with special thanks to Kiki, Rachel, Rebecca and Emma.

I would like to acknowledge my friends, Ali, Anne G., Anne J., Anita, Anna, Ber, Bernie, Catarina, Fiona, Geraldine, Gosia, Leona, Liz O'R., Liz S., Kathy, Kelly, Marian, Mary C., Mary L., Miriam, Rosemary and Sinéad for their unwavering support throughout this endeavour.

I would like to formally acknowledge Mary and Louie for their steady interest in my work and for always 'being there' for me.

Finally, I would especially like to thank Dr. Julia Walsh for her encouragement.

Dedication

For Pat, Matthew and Georgie, who offered me unconditional love and support throughout the course of this research.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acronyms

CT: Cooperating Teacher

DES: Irish Department of Education and Science

DP: Deputy Principal

EC: European Commission

EPS: Education and Professional Studies Department, Greendale University

EU: European Union

ITE: Initial Teacher Education

MUSTER: Multi Site Teacher Education Research Project

NASPE: United States National Association for Sport and Physical Education

NCTAF: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future

NBPTS: United States National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

OECD: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development

PCK: Pedagogical Content Knowledge

PDS: Professional Development Schools

PESS: Physical Education and Sports Science Department, Greendale University

PETE: Physical Education Teacher Education

PS: Partnership Schools

SP: School Principal

TDA: Training and Development Agency for Schools

TNTEE: The Thematic Network on Teacher Education

TP: Teaching Practice

UK: United Kingdom

US: United States

UT: University Tutor

WWC: What Works Clearing House

Chapter One: Introduction

Introduction

Effective Initial Teacher Education (ITE) programmes are defined by a range of key characteristics one of which it is argued, is the value they place on the strength of the school-university relationship in supporting student learning. Darling Hammond (2006b) describes this as:

> *Strong relationships, common knowledge, and shared beliefs among school and university-based faculty jointly engaged in transforming teaching, schooling and teacher education* (p.305).

A plethora of international research identifies ways in which school and university personnel, for example cooperating teachers (CTs), School Principals (SPs) and University Tutors (UTs) would, ideally, work together (Behets & Vergauwen, 2006; Brouwer & Korthagen, 2005; Cochran-Smith, 2005; Darling-Hammond, 2006a, 2006b; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Graber, 1989; Hynes-Dussel, 1999; McCullick, 2001; O'Sullivan, 2003; Youens & McCarthy, 2007). Collaboration between these roles, it is argued, enables ITE programmes to deliver shared, logical programmes of teacher education (Hardy, 1999; McIntyre, Byrd, & Foxx, 1996). A pivotal aspect of ITE is teaching practice (TP), where the school is identified as the key worksite for the school-university partnership:

> *The school...constitutes a rich environment where students [teachers] will learn a great deal of their job [therefore] placement of students [teachers] in schools is crucial in teacher preparations [with] the ecology of the school setting – pupils, physical environment, curriculum and community - a major influence on [student teacher development]* (Behets & Vergauwen, 2006, p.407-408).

Within school-university partnerships, it has been suggested that of all teacher educators, the CT has the most significant influence on the student (ibid, p.417). It can be argued, therefore, that CTs should be carefully selected and trained to mentor students; in the case of this research, physical education teacher education (PETE) students (Hardy, 1999). In addition to this, it has been argued that mentors should possess some key qualities to enable them to fulfil their role on TP. For example, a recent study by Cothran et al (2008) found that both mentors and PETE students agreed there was a:

Need for mentors who possess contextualised subject matter knowledge and experience, as well as effective communication skills (especially supportive and non-threatening demeanors) (p.8).

The notion of 'mentor' is a relatively new concept in Irish initial teacher education. The term mentoring has been described by Merriam (1983) as:

A powerful emotional interaction between an older and younger person, in a relationship in which the older mentor is trusted, loving, and experienced in the guidance of the younger (p.162).

According to Kram (1985), the mentor "*supports, guides, and counsels a young adult as he or she accomplishes mastery of the adult world or the world of work*" (p.2). In the context of initial teacher education (ITE), mentoring is defined as "*assisting student-teachers to learn how to teach in school-based settings*" (Tomlinson, 1995), also called teaching practice (TP). There have been three key initiatives in relation to mentoring in Irish teacher education:

a) **The Lucent Science Teachers Initiative (LSTI)**: This programme trained school-based science teachers to act as mentors during the TP of second-level Science student teachers at Greendale University and across twenty-five schools on the island of Ireland. This was in existence from 2000 to 2003, and having been sponsored by the Lucent Technologies K16 programme, was known as the Lucent Science Teachers Initiative. A study on the effectiveness of this programme found that when school-based mentors were trained in both cognitive and interpersonal mentoring skills, they impacted significantly on the quality of Science student teachers' TP (Kiely, 2005).

b) **Masters Degree of Education in Educational Mentoring**: Stemming from LSTI programme, a three-year taught masters degree programme in educational mentoring was developed in 2005, to educate second-level teachers as mentors for student teachers and newly qualified teachers. Teachers apply to study on this programme and the Irish Department of Education and Science funded the first year of study.

c) **The National Pilot Project on Teacher Induction**: This programme has been in existence since 2000 and trains school-based mentors to induct newly qualified primary and post primary teachers in their probation year. School Principals choose to become involved in this

programme.

As can be seen, Ireland has placed some emphasis on the importance of mentoring in teacher education in the past seven years. In spite of the developments described, the current reality for most Irish cooperating teachers is to work voluntarily as informal, untrained, unpaid mentors during TP. Cooperating teachers, in a gesture of goodwill, offer learning support to student teachers in the area of classroom management and pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) (Kiely, 2005). In spite of this altruistic work, a number of difficulties have arisen in the quality of student teacher support during TP. Specifically, there is inconsistency in both the quantity and quality of learning support offered to student teachers by cooperating teachers (ibid). Cooperating teachers seem to be confused about their exact role on TP (ibid). This can lead to difficulties in delineating the exact function of school and university personnel during TP which, again, impacts on the quality of the TP as a learning experience for student teachers (ibid). In order to investigate the complex ways in which these concerns affect student learning, this study investigates how one group of Irish student teachers; i.e. PETE students, are supported to learn during TP.

Working collaboratively with university tutors (UTs) in the Physical Education and Sports Science (PESS) and Education and Professional Studies (EPS) departments at Greendale University in Ireland, this research sought to understand how a group of Irish PETE students learned through their TP experience. The timing of the research coincided with the introduction of a new one-year Graduate Diploma in Education (Physical Education) programme at Greendale University (referred to throughout the thesis as the Grad Dip). This presented an ideal opportunity, being a one-year course, to research Irish PETE students' learning-in-action during a seven month TP placement. The research was designed to answer the following questions:

Main Research Questions

1. How are PETE students supported to learn effectively during TP within the existing partnership model?

2. How do teacher-mentors and university tutors view their roles and the nature of learning within the current model of TP supervision?
3. What is the nature of the PETE student learning that takes place on TP?
4. How does school-based learning link to other strands of the teacher education programme in supporting student teacher competence?

Sub-questions

1. What does international research literature say about teacher learning and student teacher learning?
2. From international research literature, what is known about different models of teacher learning and on what theories of learning are they based?
3. How is mentoring framed within these theories of learning?
4. Which learning theories underpin ITE supervision models?
5. What are the theoretical underpinnings of the current model of TP supervision within the Grad Dip at Greendale University?

Research Intent

Clearly, educational reform can only be successful if the knowledge, beliefs and attitudes of those involved in the reform are considered (Haney, Czerniak, & Lumpe, 1996). Therefore, in investigating the issue of professional learning support for PETE students on TP, the researcher interviewed all those centrally engaged in the process: PETE students and their cooperating teachers (CT), university tutors (UT) and school principals (SP) [Note: In one school, the Deputy Principal was interviewed as the School Principal was unavailable]. The purpose was to understand how the PETE student experienced TP in its current form and more specifically, whether and how the CT, UT and SP actively supported professional learning during this time.

Rationale

> *Teacher education remains a black box. We do not know what effective teachers do, know, believe or build on nor do we know what conditions make it possible* (Cochran-Smith, 2005, p.8).

There is, currently, intense scrutiny of evidence-based teacher education research and an *"intentional and systematic effort to unlock the black box of*

teacher education, turn the lights on inside it and shine spotlights into its corners, rafters and floorboards" (ibid, p.8). The spotlights in this research were directed at PETE students' professional learning on TP, and the ways in which the process of TP guidance and supervision supported and, at times, hindered student learning. Underpinning this research is an understanding of the complexity of learning generally, and PETE student learning in particular. Choosing to focus specifically on PETE student professional learning responds to the dearth of research in this area in Ireland.

According to Barab and Duffy (2000), there has been a shift in the emphasis of learning theories from cognitive theories that highlight individual learners, to anthropological or situative theories that focus on the social nature of learning (p.26). In situative theories, learning is associated with an increase in the ability to participate effectively in the practices of a community; thus learning is conceptualised as collaborative social practice, located in communities of practice and occurring through legitimate peripheral participation (LPP) in those communities (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Lave and Wenger (1991) argue that:

> *To be able to participate in a legitimately peripheral way entails that newcomers have broad access to arenas of mature practice* (p.110).

Lave & Wenger's view of learning has obvious implications for learning in ITE. It would appear to be helpful in gaining an understanding of the ways in which TP supervision is constructed to enable mentors to move apprentice teachers (newcomers) from LPP to full participation in the community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Applied to the school environment and to training PETE students, viewing learning as a social practice highlights the need to examine how the school context, into which a PETE student is placed for TP, can be described as a community of practice that supports these learners. Ideally, such a community of practice would comprise colleagues, mentors, student peers and university tutors, and facilitate PETE student learning through ongoing discussion, sharing and collaboration on commonly valued issues and concerns (Mawer, 1996). In this way, teacher competencies could be developed in authentic settings (Fenwick, 1999) and in *"school conditions that make it possible for new teachers to take advantage of the resources available to them"* (Cochran-Smith, 2005, p.9).

In order to address the research questions, the study investigated the ways in which, CTs, UTs and SPs worked in partnership as expert teacher educators to support Irish PETE students to learn within five case studies. The research took place within the context of TP in order to capture its authentic conditions.

In the next section, the chapter content is mapped, to provide the reader with an understanding of the organisation of the thesis.

Overview of Thesis Chapters

The *literature review* is divided into four key chapters (Two, Three, Four and Five), which discuss theories of learning, mentoring and international models of ITE and teacher learning in physical education respectively:

Chapter Two: presents a review of literature addressing key theories of learning (Behaviourism, Cognitivism, Constructivism, Situated learning, Communities of Practice) focusing specifically on situated learning theories. It is suggested that these theories are helpful in analysing and explaining PETE student learning on TP. Therefore, the chapter links the literature on teacher learning to PETE. The chapter addresses the following sub-questions:

> *Sub-question 1*: What does international research literature say about teacher learning and student teacher learning?
>
> *Sub-question 2*: From international research literature, what is known about different models of learning and on what theories of learning are they based?

Chapter Three: reviews international literature on mentoring in ITE with specific reference to PETE. It investigates the mentor-mentee relationship with respect to types, models and styles of mentoring, and identifies the characteristics of ideal mentors. This chapter also focuses on the positive and negative aspects of mentorship for both the mentor and mentee. This chapter addresses the following sub-question:

> *Sub-question 3*: How is mentoring framed within these theories of learning?

Chapter Four: reports on ITE policy and practice from different international perspectives and locates Irish policy and practice within an international framework. In addition, learning theories underpinning ITE in each country are explored. Towards the end of the chapter, there is a dedicated section on current PETE research, grounding this study firmly in its focal literature to provide the context for the research questions. This chapter addresses the following sub-questions:

Sub-question 4: Which learning theories underpin ITE supervision models?

Sub-question 5: What are the theoretical underpinnings of the current model of TP supervision within the Grad Dip at Greendale University?

Chapter Five: offers a dedicated section on current PETE research, grounding this study firmly in its focal literature to provide the context for the four main research questions:

Main Research question 1: How are PETE students supported to learn effectively during TP within the existing partnership model?

Main Research question 2: How do teacher-mentors and university tutors view their roles and the nature of learning within current model of TP supervision?

Main Research question 3: What is the nature of the PETE student learning that takes place during TP?

Main Research question 4: How does school-based learning link to other strands of the teacher education programme in supporting student teacher competence?

Chapter Six: provides an analytical overview of the research methods, explaining and justifying the decision to utilise qualitative data collection and analysis methodologies. The chapter begins with an exploration of the concept of research in general, leading to an overview of both quantitative and qualitative research paradigms from both historical and epistemological viewpoints. Thereafter, a critical discussion of specific data collection tools and data analysis strategies ensues, outlining the ways in which they were employed to address the key research questions posed in this research.

Finally, a personal critical analysis of the ways in which the researcher engaged with the research process, and learned from it, is included.

Chapters Seven through Eleven: report on each of the five case studies in turn. Each of the case studies comprised a tetrad of PETE student, CT, UT and SP. Each chapter analyses student learning and learning support from the perspective of the PETE student at the core of the case, and also the other members of the tetrad:

Chapter Seven: describes the first case study in relation to Aoife's (PETE student) experience of TP in TowerHill school and the learning support provided by her relationship with Louise (CT), Noelle (UT) and Mr. Kelly (SP).

Chapter Eight: reports on the second case study with respect to Barbara's (PETE student) experience of TP at Byron's Way school and the ways in which she was supported to learn on TP by John (CT), Liz, (UT) and Mr. Cotter (SP).

Chapter Nine: discusses the third case study in which Carol's (PETE student) TP experience at TreeTops school is described, together with the learning support offered by Michael (CT), Claire (UT) and Mr. O'Brien, Deputy Principal (DP) during TP.

Chapter Ten: details the fourth case study where Dara's (PETE student) experience of TP is charted, looking specifically at how she was helped to learn by Anita (CT), Liz (UT) and Mr. Clancy (SP).

Chapter Eleven: describes the fifth and final case study which reports how Edel (PETE student) was supported to learn during TP, at Bayview school, by Joan (CT), Claire (UT) and Mr. Noonan (SP).

The next three chapters, Twelve, Thirteen and Fourteen draw the findings of the study together:

Chapter Twelve: examines and discusses findings from this study with respect to the role of the CT in supporting PETE student learning of pedagogical

content knowledge (PCK) on TP. It further interrogates the CT qualities needed to nurture a productive learning experience. This chapter answers part of the following research question:

> *Main Research question 2*: How do teacher-mentors and university tutors view their roles and the nature of learning within current model of TP supervision?

Chapter Thirteen: analyses and discusses findings from this study in relation to the nature of the school-university partnership and the impact of this on PETE student learning. This chapter tackles:

> *Main Research question 1:* How are PETE students supported to learn effectively during TP within the existing partnership model?

And part of the following research question

> *Main Research question 2*: How do teacher-mentors and university tutors view their roles and the nature of learning within current model of TP supervision?

Chapter Fourteen: interrogates and details findings from this study with regard to the nature of PETE student learning on TP: how, what, where, when and from whom are PETE students learning during TP. Thus, this chapter addresses:

> *Main Research question 1:* How are PETE students supported to learn effectively during TP within the existing partnership model?
>
> *Main Research question 3:* What is the nature of the PETE student learning that takes place during TP?
>
> *Main Research question 4:* How does school-based learning link to other strands of the teacher education programme in supporting student teacher competence?

Chapter Fifteen concludes the thesis, assimilating all the elements of the study from the literature review, research methodologies employed, case studies and, finally, the overall findings addressing all the main research questions and sub-questions. In addition, this chapter describes the contribution of this thesis to existing knowledge, identifies limitations of the

research and recommends further research in specific areas arising from this study.

Chapter Two: Learning, Teacher Learning and PETE student Learning

Introduction

This chapter addresses the following research questions:
Sub-question 1: What does international research literature say about teacher learning and student teacher learning?
Sub-question 2: From international research literature, what is known about different models of learning and on what theories of learning are they based?

The central objective of this study is to understand how PETE student teachers are supported to learn during TP. Therefore, this chapter will address issues around how, what, where and from whom PETE students learn. It is intended that by following such a line of inquiry, a better understanding may be grasped of how a PETE student teacher learns to teach during this formative time in their ITE.

To begin, a chronicle of learning is explored ranging from individual learning theories which focus on learning as an internal mental process, to those theories of learning which propose a more anthropological and social understanding of learning, such as Legitimate Peripheral Participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p.5) and Communities of Practice (Wenger, 1998). The latter theories are underpinned by a situative and sociocultural perspective, indicating that teachers' learning is best understood as increasing participation in socially organised practices that develop teachers' professional identities (Borko, 2004) or, as Zukas (2006) terms it, the 'pedagogical identity' of the teacher In addition, this chapter will investigate formal and informal learning in the context of PETE students.

Theories of Learning

Learning theories are drawn from the human sciences, from psychology (behavioural and cognitive) and, most recently, from social theory, anthropology and linguistics (Harris, 2000, p.1). Billett (1998) describes three

phases in the development of learning theories:

> *Having cast off the deterministic nature of behaviourism and accepted the importance of cognitive structures and processes, cognitive theorists are now seeking to understand the relationships between internal processes of the mind and social and cultural sources* (p.24).

In this section, learning is examined as both, a product, process and praxis. Five theories of learning are summarised and discussed in turn in light of these three lenses; they are behaviourism, cognitivism, constructivism, situated learning, and communities of practice.

Behaviourism

The dominant theory of learning in the first half of the twentieth century was behaviourism (Harris, 2000). This theory of learning developed from the work of the Russian physiologist Ivan Pavlov on animals' responses to conditioning. His most renowned experiment, using a dog, demonstrated this concept of conditioning. Pavlov believed that humans could be conditioned to react to stimuli in the same way – a reflex response (Atherton, 2003a; Cheetham & Chivers, 2001). In this way learning was deemed to be a product of the conditioning:

> *Learning is defined as a change in behaviour. In other words, learning is approached as an outcome - the end product of some process. It can be recognised or seen. This approach has the virtue of highlighting a crucial aspect of learning - change. Its apparent clarity may also make some sense when conducting experiments. However, it is rather a blunt instrument* (Smith, 1999, p.1).

In spite of the fact that behaviourism originated in the field of psychology, it has had a much wider application. Its concepts are used in education and form the basis of the behaviourist theory of learning. Experiments by behaviourists identify **conditioning** as a universal learning process. There are two different types of conditioning, **classical** and behavioural or **operant** conditioning, each yielding a different behavioural pattern (Atherton, 2003a). Classic conditioning occurs when a natural reflex responds to a stimulus e.g. Pavlov's dog experiment. Essentially, in this view, animals and people are biologically designed so that a certain stimulus will produce a specific response (Cheetham & Chivers, 2001). Building on the work of Pavlov, Skinner developed the notion of behavioural or operant conditioning. This

occurs when a response to a stimulus is reinforced. Basically, operant conditioning is a simple feedback system. If a reward or reinforcement follows the response to a stimulus, then the response becomes more probable in the future (Cheetham & Chivers, 2001).

Therefore, in the context of learning, behaviourism is a theory that centres on behaviour modification through stimulus response and selective reinforcement. The pedagogical thrust here is on control and adaptive response (Wenger, 1998) as it focuses specifically on objectively observable behaviours. In this way, behaviourists define learning as the acquisition of new behaviour where successful learning is measured in terms of changes in behaviour (Harris, 2000). From this, it is clear that behaviourist theorists focus on external environment; an 'outside-in' view of learning (ibid).

Such a view of learning has pedagogical implications for teachers because from this perspective, the teacher is viewed as a transmitter of knowledge who controls the external environment (stimuli) of the classroom to reinforce desired changes in behaviour (or learning). Examples of such pedagogical stimulus-response strategies include teaching in instructional steps, rote learning, drilling, memorization, trial and error learning etc. Atkins (1993) refers to behaviourism as a 'collateral' view of knowledge, one in which it is completely detached from the human mind, human relationships and society. This implies that it is akin to a commodity that can be carved into smaller digestible pieces and owned. In conclusion, behaviourism is a deterministic and adaptive view of learning and human potential (Harris, 2000). The fact that the behaviour of the person is adapted without intention, and that the mind is dismissed as being an impenetrable 'black box' implies that, for behaviourists, learning is mainly a passive act (ibid). It is for these reasons that an interest in the cognitive dimensions of learning developed.

Cognitivism

In 1912, Gestalt theories emerged in opposition to behaviourism. Gestalt is the German word for 'pattern', 'figure', 'shape', or 'form' but is not precisely translatable (Atherton, 2003b). Kohler, a cognitivist and key proponent of the cognitivist theory of Gestaltism wrote:

> *The stimulus-response formula, which sounds at first so attractive, is actually quite misleading. In fact, it has so far appeared acceptable solely because behaviourists use the term 'stimulus' in such a loose fashion ... When the term is taken in its strict sense, it is not generally 'a stimulus' which elicits a response. ... A man's actions are commonly related to a well-structured field, most often to particular thing-units. The right psychological formula is therefore: pattern of stimulation - organisation - response to the products of organisation ... The stimulus-response formula ... ignores the fact that between the stimuli there occurs a pattern of organisation, particularly the formation of group-units in which parts acquire new characteristics* (Kohler, 1947, p.164).

In deference to the work of the behaviourists, cognitivists such as Piaget, Bruner, Gagne and Lewin attempted to see into the 'black box' of the human mind. "*The black box can be opened and it can become a 'glass box'* (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p.102). Lave and Wenger use this metaphor to describe how learners can understand knowledge. Here, it is used to explain how the black box of the mind can be opened through the theory of cognitivism. The founders of the Gestalt theory believed that there was more involved with learning than behaviourism allowed. They believed that there was cognitive processing. Where behaviourists focussed on the products of learning (the behaviour), cognitivists concentrated on the processes by which people learn. In this way, the cognitive perspective centred on: *"what happens between stimulus and response"* (Atkins, 1993, p.257). This involves processes such as "*memorising, concept formation and the use of symbols and language*" (Cheetham & Chivers, 2001, p.251). Cognitivists argue that while things like the environment are important inputs to learning, learning is more than simply the collection of inputs and the production of outputs. The mind has the ability to synthesise, analyse, formulate, and extract received information and stimuli in order to produce things that cannot be directly attributed to the inputs given. Cognitivists, therefore, view learning as where:

> *The individual learner gains environmental data via the senses (sensory input). This data are processed and organised (thinking). Thereafter, the learner can act on the world (the output of thinking - activity)* (Harris, 2000, p.2).

Therefore, the process of improving cognitive ability is incremental and essentially unidirectional and linear *(ibid)*.

> *The tools for learning are individuals' existing cognitive structures or 'schematas'. As new sensory input is gained, existing structures/schemata undergo modification. The*

> *key to successful learning therefore lies in the quality of the processing that occurs between the short-term and long term memory* (ibid, p.3).

The pedagogical application of cognitivism is on the processing and transmission of information through communication, explanation, recombination, contrast, inference and problem solving (Wenger, 1998). In addition, the learning is seen as an asocial activity with little value being attached to group work because tasks are seen as 'stable across learners' which are common to all (Harris, 2000). Much emphasis is placed on linking prior knowledge to new knowledge and learning at a 'deep' or 'surface level'. The teacher remains the manager of the information-input process; but the learner is more active in planning and carrying out his/her own learning than in the behaviourist environment. Teaching is not simply something that is done to a learner but rather involves the learner and empowers their internal mental processes.

It can be argued that both behaviourism and cognitivism formed the basis for defining education, and teacher education, as a process of transmitting knowledge from the expert to novice learner. Nicholls (1997) emphasises that this transmission model of education considers knowledge to be external to the learner and to be acquired through a variety of activities such as practising procedures developed by others. The teacher's role is to prepare and transmit information to learners and the learners' role is to receive, store, and act upon this information (Tishman, Jay, & Perkins, 1993). Making the link with the current study, this type of instruction can be found in 'traditional' teacher education models. Moreover, teacher learning is seen as detached from the environment or context:

> *In cognitive theory learning is essentially learning 'within the head' of the individual - it often allows the individual to predict and derive the right decision without any overt false trial* (Klix, 1982, p.388).

Within this context, constructivist pedagogy and the philosophy underlying it seem to emerge as a reaction against the transmission model. Atherton (2003b) captures the link between each of these learning theories in the following extract:

> *If behaviourism treats the organism as a black box, cognitive theory recognises the importance of the mind in making sense of the material with which it is presented. Nevertheless, it still presupposes that the role of the learner is primarily to assimilate*

> *whatever the teacher presents. Constructivism — in its 'social' forms — suggests that the learner is much more actively involved in a joint enterprise with the teacher (and other students) of creating new meanings* (p.1).

In summary, cognitivism deems the context of learning (excepting the learning environment) to be largely irrelevant to the learning process. Although some cognitivist theories emphasise learner agency, rarely do they highlight learner judgement or critical analysis. Thinking and learning are viewed as skills, the effectiveness of which is determined by individuals' innate cognitive structures. Therefore, a person's learning capacity is limited by the pedigree of his/her cognitive structures. The sanitised, rule bound focus of the learning situation does not take cognisance of the *"messy, ambiguous, and context-sensitive processes of meaning making"* (Bruner, 1999, p.151) that some argue to be central to learning (Wenger, 1998).

Constructivism

Duncombe & Armour (2004) capture both the essence of and relationship between the three influential theories of learning:

> *Behaviourism concerns the ways in which behaviours are learned through trial and error experiences, cognitivism is concerned with the mind and how it makes sense of the information it receives and constructivism focuses the ways in which knowledge is constructed and is based on the reactions with others and the environment* (p.247).

'Constructivism' describes a range of theories about learning which emphasise a person's active involvement in personal learning, where learning is most effective when it is active, interactive, and authentic (Newmann, 1994). Therefore, constructivists actively encourage learners to construct new understandings and meanings based upon the foundations of their prior learning and experiences, instead of passively receiving the external, 'objective' reality from an authority, a teacher, or a book (Atherton, 2003b; Duncombe & Armour, 2004). Each student has prior learning constructed out of reflection upon his experiences, therefore, it follows that the teacher must first elicit a student's own ideas on any new topic and build on (construct) such new knowledge through active learning. The teacher has the responsibility for *"facilitating the development of learner agency in the process of meaning construction"* (Harris, 2000, p.5). Such active learning methodologies encourage students to make connections between prior and

new knowledge thus creating new understandings and engaging learners in the active learning process. In this way the pedagogical focus is *"task-oriented...hands-on, self-directed activities oriented towards design and discovery"* (Wenger, 1998) and the classroom has an energetic noisy environment (Holt-Reynolds, 2000).

Within the umbrella term, constructivism, there are two types of constructivist theory: cognitive constructivism and social constructivism. Cognitive constructivism, which is mainly associated with the work of Jean Piaget, emphasises how the learner understands things in terms of developmental stages and learning styles. Social constructivism, founded on the work of Vygotsky, highlights how meanings and understandings grow out of social encounters, particularly with adults or more experienced learners (Atherton, 2003b).

Cognitive constructivism emerged from the work of Swiss biologist and psychologist Jean Piaget. Initially Piaget worked extensively with water snails and then moved on to studying children and how they learn! Interestingly, rather than merely observing children, he actively engaged with them to discover how their minds work and mature over time to gain an increased understanding of the world around them. He proposed that children's thinking is not a smooth transition through each of his four stages (sensori-motor, preoperational, concrete operations and formal operations). Instead, there are key maturation spurts where a child's learning "takes off" and moves into completely new areas and capabilities (Atherton, 2003b). In this way, Piaget placed an emphasis on the active role of the individual in learning. Borrowing some of the cognitive ideologies, he too believed that children's minds were not empty vessels and that children actively processed the material with which they were presented through accommodation and assimilation (ibid). Furthermore, he emphasised that prior knowledge played a crucial role in learning (Duncombe & Armour, 2004). Piaget summarised his approach as follows:

> *Education for most people means trying to lead the child to resemble the typical adult of his society (whereas) for me education means making creators* (Palmer, 2001, p.38).

If Piaget's thinking is applied to teacher education, it becomes clear that the student teacher is viewed as actively engaged in the learning process. Furthermore, it could be argued that student teachers must learn to direct their own learning and, through this, construct their own understandings of the world around them. It follows that making such a link with the environment implies that teacher education should constantly reinforce the link between theory and practice or 'the rub between theory and practice' (Miller & Silvernail, 1994)

In tandem with the work of Piaget, Vygotsky (1896-1934) explored the link between social interaction and the construction of meanings (understandings). In this way, Vygotsky proposed that social interaction and significant others play an important role in learning. Vygotsky developed a social cognition learning model. This model contends that culture is the prime determinant of individual development (Doolittle, 1997). Culture impacts on the person's intellectual development by teaching them both what to think (knowledge) and how to think (tools of intellectual adaptation). The person learns through shared problem solving experiences with parent, teacher or peers, with responsibility for learning gradually moving to the person. The conduit for such learning is the language of the culture (Vygotsky, 1962). As learning progresses, the person's own language becomes his/her primary tool of intellectual adaptation. Eventually, individuals can use internal language to direct their own behaviour. A difference exists between what a person can do on his/her own and what the person can do with help. Vygotskians call this difference the zone of proximal development. It was his theory of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) which formed the foundation of social constructivist theory (Vygotsky, 1978). In essence, Vygotsky discovered that to advance pupil learning, an adult or expert needed to challenge them constantly on their thinking:

> *The distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance or in collaboration with more capable peers* (Vygotsky, 1978, p.86).

Lave & Wenger's (1991) theory of situated learning builds on Vygotsky's theory.

Situated Learning

As has been noted in the previous theories of learning (behaviourism, cognitivism and constructivism), learning is often viewed as:

> *An individual process, that it has a beginning and an end, that it is best separated from the rest of our activities and it is the result of teaching* (Wenger, 1998, p.3)

However, the anthropological work of Lave & Wenger (1991) on apprenticeship reconceptualised learning as a dimension of social practice and, importantly, a process of becoming a member of a community of practice. This led Lave & Wenger (1991) to formulate concepts of situated learning and Legitimate Peripheral Participation in communities of practice. Using these concepts, learning is viewed as an integral part of generative social practice focusing on the whole person acting in society. Thus, the learner acts within the environment rather than on it (Harris, 2000) presupposing, therefore, that it is the social interactions *and* the environment that foster learning. Furthermore, it is in the process of practice that people learn; indeed learning is a *'feature of practice'* so it may be present in all sorts of activities, not just in formal instruction or apprenticeship (Hanks, 1991). Therefore, Lave and Wenger (1991) explored learning in both formal and informal contexts, thus developing their theory of Legitimate Peripheral Participation.

From a situative perspective, learning occurs whenever individuals interact. Moreover, learning is a highly interactive process where newcomers have a wide access to all of the community of practice activities. Through this access, newcomers learn to perform new tasks and develop new understandings. In essence, knowledge or learning is the currency of enculturation into a community (Guile & Young, 1998) or a way of belonging (Lave & Wenger, 1991). In this way, becoming knowledgeable results in the *'production of new meanings'* and also the *'construction of identities'*; processes which are intertwined (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p.5). According to Barab & Duffy (2000) these processes are linked with motivation; i.e. learning the practices of the community in order to move from legitimate peripheral participation to full participation in the community.

In addition, because situative learning acknowledges the social nature of learning, learning becomes a multi-directional process with newcomers and old timers learning from each other (Hanks, 1991; Lave & Wenger, 1991). Lave & Wenger refer to the constant turnover of community of practice members as *"reproduction cycles"* (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p.98). This essentially means that old timers leave and newcomers enter. It is interesting to focus on how new members move from peripheral to full participation (ibid, p.71):

> *Legitimate peripheral participation provides a way to speak about the relations between newcomers and old-timers, and about activities, identities, artefacts and communities of knowledge and practice. It concerns the process by which newcomers become part of a community of practice* (ibid, p.29).

Linking the notion of legitimate peripheral participation to ITE, Lave and Wenger (1991) state *that "To be able to participate in a legitimately peripheral way entails that newcomers have broad access to arenas of mature practice"* (p.110). This has obvious implications for how TP is constructed, specifically in relation to the use of mentors (old timers) in training apprentice teachers (newcomers).

As was noted in the introduction to this thesis, according to Barab and Duffy (2000, p.26), there has been a shift in the emphasis of learning theories from cognitive learning theories, which emphasise individual learners, to anthropological or situative theories, which focus on the social nature of learning. In this latter view, learning to think is associated with increasing one's ability to participate effectively in the practices of a community. Thus, this perspective furthers the idea of learning as a collaborative social practice. In short,

> *With its emphasis on the relation between knowledge and the situations in which it is acquired, the situative perspective offers a compelling framework for the study of teacher education through mentoring* (Patton et al., 2005, p.305).

For this reason, this study will analyse the supervision of TP in ITE from a situative perspective. Fenwick (1999) outlines how, within a research context, the situative perspective allows the researcher to analyse authentic conditions (i.e. during ITE) such as how individuals participate in a system by interacting with the community (with its history, assumptions and cultural values, rules, and patterns of relationship), the tools at hand (including objects, technology,

languages and images), and the moment's activity (its purposes, norms, and practical challenges). In order to understand such 'authentic conditions', the next section analyses the Community of Practice theory of learning and how this links with this research.

Communities of Practice

Wenger (1998) explains this term in the following extract:

> *Being alive as human beings means that we are constantly engaged in the pursuit of enterprises of all kinds, from ensuring our physical survival to seeking the most lofty pleasures. As we define these enterprises and engage in their pursuit together, we interact with each other and with the world accordingly. In other words we learn.*
> *Over time, this collective learning results in practices that reflect both the pursuit of our enterprises and the attendant social relations. These practices are thus the property of a kind of community created over time by the sustained pursuit of a sustained enterprise. It makes sense therefore, to call these kinds of communities, communities of practice* (p.45).

Communities of practice, according to Wenger (1998) are everywhere and we are generally involved in a number of them; they are an integral part of our daily lives. Lave & Wenger (1991) describe this intersection of communities of practice in the following:

> *A community of practice is a set of relations among persons, activity, and world over time and in relation with other tangential and overlapping communities of practice* (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p.98).

Teachers are part of such a community of practice. They may also be part of a larger community of practice within their school that includes administrators, students and parents (Kirk & Macdonald, 1998). There are decided advantages to describing the activities of teachers as 'communities of practice' because by using such a framework, it is possible to identify the social and cultural factors that impinge on what is learned and how learning takes place (ibid).

A Community of Practice is a persistent, sustained social network of individuals who share '*social capital*' (Putnam, 2000); i.e. a knowledge base, set of beliefs, values, history and experiences focused on a common practice and/or mutual enterprise (Barab, Barnett, & Squire, 2002). The key indicators of social capital include social relations, formal and informal social networks, group membership, reciprocity, trust, and civic engagement (Bailey, 2005,

p.75; Office for National Statistics, 2001). Social capital is generally understood as *"the property of the group rather than the property of the individual"* (Office for National Statistics, 2001, p.4). The defining characteristics of communities of practice are mutual engagement of the members around a joint enterprise, encompassing a shared repertoire of communal resources that includes:

> *Routines, words, tools, ways of doing things, stories, gestures, symbols, genres, actions, or concepts that the community has produced or adopted in the course of its existence, and which have become part of its practice* (Wenger, 1998, p.83).

More than this, the community is defined by its practice in which explicit and implicit knowledge, or curriculum, are negotiated; that is, meaning is constructed through what the community actually does. According to Dewey (1916) no thought can possibly be conveyed as an idea from one person to another. Learners need to interpret the idea in light of their current interests and understandings if they are to have any thoughts (ibid, p.188). Thus, it is impossible to make sense of new ideas without linking them to existing concepts because then, and only then, will knowledge become useful. Essentially, learning occurs through observation, experimentation, reflective practice, and making errors.

The curriculum of the community of practice can be divided into its formal and hidden aspects. The formal curriculum is primarily the knowledge, skills and understanding that teacher educators intend PETE students to acquire. The hidden curriculum consists of what PETE students learn from their participation in ITE but which is not planned as the official curriculum. The hidden curriculum exercises a profound influence on PETE students and can often be overlooked. It can be a vehicle for achieving both desirable and undesirable ends (Hargreaves, 2001, p.494). Therefore, the real impact of ITE lies in how the images of teacher, learner, knowledge, and school curriculum are subtly communicated to prospective teachers through the processes of the hidden curriculum of teacher education programmes (Bartholomew, 1976; Ginsburg, 1988; Giroux, 1980; Popkewitz, 1985). T.S. Eliot's description of the 'shadow' captures this notion of the hidden curriculum:

Between the idea

And the reality

Between the motion and the act

Falls the Shadow ...

Between the conception

And the creation

Between the emotion

And the response

Falls the Shadow ...(The Hollow Men, T.S. Eliot, 1961)

The hidden curriculum, or shadow, of ITE operates in tandem with the overt curriculum.

In 1916, Dewey noted the connection between learning and experience. He described:

> *Education is that reconstruction or reorganisation of experience which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experience* (pp. 89-90).

For the norms, beliefs, and practices of becoming a teacher to become part of that teacher, learning must be experiential. When explicit and implicit knowledge are negotiated through practice, both formal and informal learning can take place. Werthner and Trudel (2006) term formal or structured learning as mediated learning (where the learning is directed by another person) and informal as unmediated learning (where there is no instructor and the learner takes the initiative and is responsible for choosing what to learn). Thus, the practice is itself a learning process. Wenger (1998) summarises this concept as *"learning is the engine of practice, and practice is the history of that learning"* within a community of practice (p.96). In this way, learning and practice are inextricably linked.

Situated learning theory is the theoretical framework underpinning the notion of Community of Practice, which implies that learning is social and occurs throughout our daily lives (Lave & Wenger, 1991). According to Herrington and Oliver (2000), in the context of teacher education, the situated learning experience (authentic learning experience) within the overlapping school communities of practice has nine characteristics: authentic contexts, authentic activities, access to expert performances, multiple roles and perspectives, collaborative construction of knowledge, opportunities for reflection,

opportunities for articulation, coaching and scaffolding and authentic assessment of learning.

As discussed earlier, learning is a social process in which newcomers and old-timers learn from each other in a multidirectional process within the community of practice. The notion of Legitimate Peripheral Participation explains the movement of newcomers from the periphery of the community of practice to become full participants at its amorphous core, and how newcomers move in and old-timers move out in 'reproduction cycles' as the community of practice evolves (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Thus, this movement from the periphery to the centre means becoming progressively more engaged and active in the practice of the community. Wenger and Snyder (2000) commented that the community:

> *Typically has a core of participants whose passion for the topic energises the community and who provide intellectual and social leadership* (p. 3).

The core is characterised by participation and commitment, rather than expertise and mastery, although those are components of the core. Lave and Wenger (1991) argued that *"mastery resides not in the master but in the organisation of the community of practice of which the master is a part"* (p. 95). If Legitimate Peripheral Participation is the process by which newcomers become old-timers, as part of the process the newcomer realises that formal access to the core must not only be negotiated, but access to this hidden transcript of the back stage, earned. The newcomer craves access to front and backstage (Goffman, 1959). In this metaphor, knowledge of both the 'front and back stage' represents full participation in the community of practice. Heaney (1995) pointed out that the newcomer exercises individual agency, choosing to move on the periphery of the community of practice. In essence, he asserted that learning in this context is defined as *"an individual's ongoing negotiation with communities of practice which ultimately gives definition to both self and that practice"* (p.2).

Studies which adopt a situative perspective must focus on:

> *The individual teacher (including the teacher's biography, values, goals and capabilities); the act of teaching; the physical, social and cultural school environment* (Rovegno, 2003, p.296).

Going deeper than this, when employing a socio-cultural perspective, any

examination of teachers' learning and socialisation needs to consider the *"person-in-practice-in-person"* (Lerman, 2000, p.28). This allows a study to shift the analytical focus between the individual and the social. From this perspective, learning is transformation through increasing participation in social practices (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Therefore, a mechanism for learning would need to take account of the goals of the individual in joining, or being coerced into joining, the social practice (Lerman, 2000, p.35).

Legitimate peripherality is a complex concept, implicated in social structures involving relations of power. Thus, peripherality can be a 'place of power' as the newcomer moves toward more intense participation (Heaney, 1995) or where *"one is kept from participating more fully – a disempowering position"* (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p.36). Heaney (1995) describes peripherality as having the *"dynamic and at times chaotic energy which is experienced on the edge where the frenzy of transformative learning is more likely to occur"* (p.3). Transformative learning occurs when learners change their *"meaning schemes (specific beliefs, attitudes, and emotional reactions) and engage in critical reflection on their experiences, which in turn leads to a perspective* transformation" (Mezirow, 1991, p.167). However, as has already been intimated, legitimate peripheral participation is not always a positive experience. It can also be:

> *Disempowering, decentering, and dehumanizing in the conflict across borders and within communities as various constituencies compete on an unequal field of power* (ibid, p.3).

Clearly, being positioned at the border or on the periphery describes a space and time of tremendous potential energy and this can be a constructive or a destructive energy. Where there is destructive energy, newcomers sometimes experience difficulties in accessing the community of practice. This is more than simply the initial 'benign community neglect' which allows them to acclimatise to the periphery of the community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p.93). Indeed, Becker (1972) describes detrimental happenings when structural constraints in work organisations may limit or prevent apprentices' access to the full range of activities of the job and hence to possibilities for learning what they need to know to master a trade

Lave & Wenger (1991) assert how such control and selection, as well as the need for access, are inherent in communities of practice. Thus access is liable to manipulation, giving *"legitimate peripherality an ambivalent status"* (ibid, p.103). Depending on the organisation of access, legitimate peripherality can either promote or hinder legitimate peripheral participation, to the extent that the:

> *Community of practice routinely sequesters newcomers, either very directly or in a more subtle and pervasive way and these newcomers are prevented from legitimate peripheral participation* (ibid, p.104).

To counteract this sequestration, Lave & Wenger (1991) advocate that *"transparency in its simplest form may just imply that the inner workings of an artefact are available for the learner's inspection"* (p.102). Merriam, Courtenay & Baumgartner (2003) describe how the trajectory of participation mutually reinforces the learning trajectory (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p.36). Similarly, Billett (1998) proposed that the amount and nature of cognitive change (learning trajectory) will be a function of the following: the extent to which participation is non-routine, the individual's prior knowledge base, one's access to and standing in the community of practice, the duration of one's participation, and how much guidance one has in the goal-directed activities of the community. In other words, the newcomer will engage in Legitimate Peripheral Participation if they are committed to the community of practice, respected for their prior knowledge, and guided by old timers towards full participation. Clearly, this *"interplay of conflict and synergy is central to all aspects of learning in practice"* (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p.103), but conflict may have a stifling effect on learning at the periphery, thus curbing the trajectory of learning into the core of the community of practice.

Turning to the notion of individual agency (Heaney, 1995), access to the community of practice can also be viewed through another lens, that of the individual's or newcomer's motivation to join the community of practice. What entices them to stand on the edge and want to move toward the centre of the community of practice? Little is written in the literature about how individuals find their way to particular communities of practice and, once encountered, become legitimate peripheral participants. One explanation centres on the concept of 'identity'.

Wenger (1998) suggests that a newcomer, when travelling along the 'learning trajectory' builds their identity. Identity is a temporal thing:

> *Not an object, but a constant becoming. Our identity is something we constantly renegotiate during the course of our lives* (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p.153).

According to Wenger (1998), *"Building an identity consists of negotiating the meanings of our experience of membership in social communities"* (p.145). Identity will not change without learning. Merriam et al (2003) describe learning as the lynchpin without which there would be no changes in identity. The intertwining of development and learning is embedded in developmental models of identity formation. With regard to development in adulthood, Mezirow (2000) wrote that:

> *Development in adulthood may be understood as a learning process—a phased and often transformative process of meaning becoming clarified through expanded awareness, critical reflection, validating discourse, and reflective action* (p.25).

This learning process is situated within the social world:

> *Human beings are essentially relational. Our identity is formed in webs of affiliation within a shared lifeworld . . . It is within the context of these relationships, governed by existing and changing cultural paradigms, that we become the persons we are* (p.27)

Throughout the teaching career, a teacher's identity is both malleable and ductile as the teacher moves through a process of identity construction to form his/her pedagogic identity (Zukas, 2006)

In essence, teachers have a range of identities of which being a subject expert is key, but not viewed as sufficient in itself: the caring teacher, the coach, the empowering teacher, the leader, the risk taker and the change agent. This apparent multiplicity supports the claims about diversity and plurality in teacher identities. An important part of identity construction is positioning in relation to others. While identities may be defined by the self, they are the product of interaction between the self and others.

Conclusion

Clearly, viewing learning from a community of practice perspective has implications for views on how teachers should be trained. Ideally, new teachers (newcomers) would be members of overlapping communities of practice comprising peers, supportive work colleagues, mentors, and their

university peers and tutors, within which there is ongoing discussion, sharing, and collaboration on commonly valued issues and concerns (Mawer, 1996). These newcomers would engage in a process of meaning-making to form both their personal and pedagogic identity. It is evident that the newcomer needs to be both self-motivated and supported by oldtimers to harness the potential energy at the periphery and thus move along the learning trajectory from legitimate peripheral participation to full participation in the community of practice. In the next chapter, this concept will be explored in detail by focusing on the notion of mentoring in the context of the community of practice.

Chapter Three: Mentoring

Introduction

This chapter responds to the following research question:

Sub-question 3: How is mentoring framed within these theories of learning?

In Homer's Odyssey, Mentor (or Mentês), an Ithacan noble and the son of Alcumus, was a wise counsellor to his friend Odysseus. When Odysseus left to fight in the Trojan War, he placed Mentor in charge of his son, Telemachus, and of his palace. Mentor was entrusted with the welfare, education and protection of Telemachus. Athena, goddess of war, handicraft and wisdom, assumed the guise of Mentor when she accompanied Telemachus in search of his father. This journey was captured in a book, published in 1699, entitled "Les Aventures de Telemaque", by the French Archbishop, theologian and writer François Fénelon. Fénelon created this book in order to educate the grandson of Louis XIV. This is the first recorded modern mention of mentoring (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2008). Remarkably, the definition of mentoring portrayed by Fénelon has endured.

Mentoring is a wide ranging concept as it is often defined in relation to styles and types of relationships involved in mentoring and to variations in perceived benefits of mentoring and mentorship (Patton et al., 2005). The etymology of the word mentor comes from the noun 'mentos' meaning intent, purpose, spirit or passion; wise advisor; 'man-tar' one who thinks; 'mon-i-tor' one who admonishes (Online Etymological Dictionary, 2007). The current day understanding of mentoring is rooted in its origin, and an inspection of dictionary definitions reveals it to be construed as 'a wise and trusted guide and advisor'; 'a wise and trusted counsellor or teacher'; an 'experienced advisor and supporter'; 'a guide, a wise and faithful counsellor'; a person who gives another person help and advice over a period of time and often also teaches them how to do their job'. For example, in the education literature mentoring has been described as:

> *A powerful emotional interaction between an older and younger person, in a relationship in which the older mentor is trusted, loving, and experienced in the guidance of the younger* (Merriam, 1983 ,p.162).

Detailing the context of the mentoring relationship, Kram (1985) connotes that the mentor:

> *Supports, guides, and counsels a young adult as he or she accomplishes mastery of the adult world or the world of work* (p. 2).

The adjectives wise, trusted, guiding, supportive, loving, emotional and faithful invoke the rich tapestry of the mentoring role, but also portray the mentor as all-knowing and the person being mentored, as inexperienced and, almost, passive. In the literature on 'mentoring', there is a wide range of terms used to describe the student of the mentor. Manathunga (2007) identifies a:

> *Level of ambiguity about mentoring...inherent in deciding upon which label to apply to s/he who is mentored. Are they mentorees or mentees or protégés?* (p.209).

This variety of labels perhaps reflects a lack of clarity around the relationship between the pair. For consistency, the term mentee is adopted throughout this chapter, and in order to provide a background to this research, mentoring is investigated within teacher education. Thereafter, a discussion ensues regarding the quality of the mentoring relationship and how styles of mentoring and characteristics of ideal mentors impinge on this. This leads to a discussion on the selection and training of mentors within ITE, and more specifically, within PETE TP.

Mentoring and Teacher Education

'Mentor' and 'mentoring' may well be '*transcendental semantic signifiers*' viewable from a variety of perspectives, open to various interpretations in different applications and settings (Morton-Cooper & Palmer, 1993). According to Colwell (1998) there are *two types* of mentoring: 'classical mentoring' and 'instrumental mentoring' (Colwell, 1998). The premise underpinning 'classical mentoring' is one of informal or spontaneous meetings with two individuals coming together voluntarily for mutual personal and professional growth (Colwell, 1998). In this instance, the mentor gives feedback and helpful advice. In contrast, 'instrumental mentoring' is more formal or facilitated and is defined by mentee need and mentor expertise (Ragins & Cotton, 1999). In this type of mentoring, mentors require training in order to improve the quality and effectiveness of instruction. Zimpher & Rieger

(1988) argue that if there is a blurring of boundaries and the type of mentoring being offered is not carefully delineated, a 'shaky' mentee-mentor relationship can result. Within the field of teacher education, it could be argued that 'instrumental mentoring' is required. However, Newcombe (1988) cites three key differences between 'instrumental mentoring' employed in education and in other fields. Firstly, in education, the mentor is normally assigned to a student teacher or beginner teacher, instead of allowing a relationship to develop organically over time. Secondly, features of the school setting can prevent the mentor-mentee from developing a symbiotic relationship which, according to Patton et al (2005) *"dilutes the process of discovery"* (p.327). Thirdly, mentoring programmes in the educational setting are normally of short duration in contrast to longer mentor/mentee relationships established in other contexts.

Relationship between Mentor and Mentee

The relationship between the mentor and mentee is a '*dyadic exchange process*' that can be described as *hierarchial* or *reciprocal* (Campbell & Campbell, 2000). In the hierarchial view, mentorship is perceived as a relationship where the mentee is seen as the subordinate and the mentor viewed as the expert (Danielson, 2002) and where the mentor has greater social and intellectual status than the mentee (Reohr, 1981). Within situated learning theory, the concept of Legitimate Peripheral Participation, as defined by Lave & Wenger (1991) seems to subscribe to the view of the mentor-student teacher relationship as being that of expert-subordinate. In Legitimate Peripheral Participation, the newcomer (mentee) through learning the practices of the community eventually becomes an old timer, fully participating in his/her overlapping communities of practice within, for example, a school. The movement from newcomer to oldtimer is guided formally and informally by expert 'mentors' (oldtimers). In contrast to a hierarchical view of mentoring, a *reciprocal* relationship encourages the development of both mentor and mentee as partners through collaboration and reflection (Campbell & Campbell, 2000). Whether the mentor-mentee relationship is hierachical or reciprocal is often defined by whether mentoring is perceived as mentor-centred or mentee-centred.

Models and Styles of Mentoring

Within teacher education, Brooks (1996) identifies three models of mentoring used with pre-service teachers all of which appear mentor-centred. In each model, the mentor assumes a different role. Mentors are deemed skilled craftsmen in the *apprenticeship model*, trainers in the *competence based model* and coach, critical friend and co-enquirer in the *reflective practitioner model*. Martin (1996) described three phases within the mentor-mentee relationship. The first phase is *formal* where, for example, the PETE students present themselves to the expert teacher. In the second phase, any initial barriers are broken down and the relationship eases due to increased trust, respect and confidence, resulting in the mentor-mentee becoming more *friendly*. In the final phase the PETE students, perhaps, see themselves as *prospective teachers* as confidence in their expertise grows.

An alternative view to a mentor-centred focus, is to shift the emphasis and design mentoring systems around the needs of the individual mentee or PETE student. Glickman, Gordon & Ross-Gordon (2001) assert that mentoring should be mentee-centred and therefore the style of mentoring should be aligned with mentee needs. They put forward *three styles* of mentoring, depending on the mentee-needs: directive; non-directive and collaborative (Glickman et al., 2001). However, Furlong and Maynard (1995) argue that, in reality, mentors have to move between each style in order to meet mentee needs. Such needs are defined by the mentee's levels of abstract thinking, expertise and commitment (Glickman et al., 2001). A mentee who operates at a low conceptual level and has a low commitment to teaching may require the mentor to use a directive style in order to identify objectives and direct how and when these are achieved. On the other hand, mentees who have a reasonable level of abstract thinking and commitment to their teaching may benefit from a more synergisitic, collaborative style where mentor and mentee are partners in planning the development of the mentee. At another level, a non-directive style of mentoring may be suited to those mentees who have a high level of abstract thinking and who are fully committed to teaching. Here, the mentor can take a more passive role: listening, reflecting, clarifying, encouraging, and problem solving (Glickman et al., 2001). In deciding to adopt a particular style, the mentor must recognise that every mentee-mentor

relationship is unique and, as such, *"is shaped by the individuals, their goals and the school context"* (Patton et al., 2005, p.313).

Characteristics of Ideal Mentors

Having a mentee-centred approach to mentorship, requires that the mentor possesses certain characteristics. Yamamota (1988) describes the paradox of mentorship comprising *"an experience of transcendence for the mentor and transformation for the mentee...or change in perspective (p.187).* Therefore, according to Yamamoto (1988), the principal function of the mentor is:

> *Iconoclastic in nature so as to throw the [mentee] off his or her comfortable and customary perch...making the familiar unfamiliar [forcing] a reexamination of the known world* (p.187).

To achieve this, effective mentors need particular interpersonal traits with high levels of emotional intelligence; they should be intentional role models (Gilbert, 1985) and well-known as scholars and professionals (Manathunga, 2007). It is argued by Kram (1985) that the most successful mentors are those who volunteer to mentor and who also want to enhance their own career development. In essence:

> *Mentoring is seen as a reciprocal relationship in a work environment between an advanced career incumbent (mentor) and a beginner (protégé) aimed at promoting the career of both* (Healy & Welchert, 1990, p. 17).

Therefore, the mentoring act can be deemed both altruistic and self-promoting as the mentor-mentee relationship is often a vehicle for achieving midlife 'generativity' (Erikson, 1963):

> *A transcendence of stagnating self-preoccupation via exercise of an instinctual drive to create and care for new life, whether in the form...of productivity, or of creativity* (Erikson, 1977, p.1).

In this way, being a mentor is a positive influence on experienced teachers who are in need of renewed impetus in their careers (McCaughtry & Rovegno, 2003). Furthermore, Cox (2000) suggests that central to the notion of mentor self-promotion is the idea that effective mentors have an understanding of self or an emotional competence and *"are comfortable in their own skin"* (p.2). Having such traits, the mentor functions in developing the mentee's career and also their psychosocial skills, linking to Fromm's (1956) view that the mentor is *"not only, or even primarily, a source of knowledge but his function is to convey certain attitudes"* (p.117). Kram (1995) outlines the palette of mentor career functions as sponsorship, exposure and visibility, providing

challenges, protection and training in ethical procedures. The psychosocial function relates to fostering competence, identity and self-efficacy through role modelling, counselling and friendship. It is argued that an experienced, emotionally competent mentor, can move easily between each function using *"deep listening"* (Snowber, 2005, p.345) as a key mentoring skill:

> *Listening to everything in the interaction, the mood, tone and posture of the mentee, not just what is said but on all the forms of communication. [It is the duty of the mentor to listen to the] passion and purpose, perhaps not yet revealed, in the one being mentored* (ibid, p.345).

In so doing, the mentor's task is *"to open up a hospitable space allowing the student to be herself, because she is received graciously"* (O'Reilly, 1998, p.8). Overall, the range of mentoring skills allows the effective mentor to fulfill a number of roles:

> *Good mentors are critical friends, personal guides, counselors, engaged in a relationship that can become as fundamental to the personal development of the mentor as to the development of the mentee* (Fletcher, 1998, p.110).

Within this 'hospitable space', the mentor introduces the following concepts to the mentee *"good practice of teaching, learning how and why good teaching comes about and moral support"* (ibid). This knowledge is the currency of mentoring, passed from mentor to the mentee (PETE student), which can be described as 'Pedagogical Content Knowledge' or PCK (Shulman, 1986) encompassing:

> *An amalgam of all teachers' cognitions, including declarative and procedural knowledge, beliefs and values that influence their preactive, interactive and postactive teaching activities* (Zanting, Verloop, & Vermunt, 2003, p.196).

This, in itself, is not enough as it is not only important to articulate the 'how of teaching', but, the 'why of teaching' must also be shared if true *"experiential wisdom"* is to be conveyed to the PETE student (ibid, p.196).

Self-Actualisation and Mentoring

Fletcher (1998) uses the concept of self-actualisation to explain the intrinsic benefits of mentorship to the mentor. Maslow (1971) describes self-actualising people as being devoted, working at something; something which is very precious to them akin to a religious vocation. A self-actualising teacher, therefore, is devoted to the practice of teaching as a part of his or her own being. Armour & Fernandez-Balboa (2001) argue that teaching is more than an occupation, it is a mergence of personal biography and pedagogy; or, as

Camancho and Fernandez-Balboa (2006) describe it, bio-pedagogy, reflecting the "*intimate relationship between personhood and pedagogy*" (p.1). In this view, mentoring is construed as being an inherent part of the teaching role i.e. the education of the next generation of teachers, and so it follows that the act of mentoring can serve to reinforce the self-actualisation of the mentor/teacher.

In ecological theory, human relationships are developed through person-environment exchanges where the ability of an organism to thrive in an environment is linked to the 'goodness of fit' between the person and the environment, the satisfaction of mutual needs, ability to cope, deal with stressors and the availability of supports (Germain & Gitterman, 1987). In order for the mentor-mentee relationship to thrive, it can be argued that there should also be a 'goodness of fit' (ibid). In the frenzy of the real world, obstacles may hamper mentor and mentee self-actualisation and thus prevent a 'goodness of fit' (ibid). These obstacles are (a) phase of mentor or mentee in personal life (Levinson, 1978) and (b) phase of mentor in professional life (Sikes, 1992).

In relation to how mentor or mentee's *phase in personal life* (Levinson, 1978) might hamper the 'goodness of fit' (Germain & Gitterman, 1987), there are a number of considerations. The first is encompassed in the term person-pedagogue (Armour & Fernandez-Balboa, 2001), where teachers' lives become an integral part of the act of teaching. Therefore, it follows that both the mentor and the mentee's (PETE student's) lives impinge on the mentoring relationship (Levinson, 1978). Taking account of the fact that the mentoring relationship is built on trust and collegiality (Merriam, 1983), difficulties may also arise if there are differences in personality. To circumvent these issues which are unique to each mentoring relationship (Patton et al., 2005), Blackburn, Cameron & Chapman (1981) have identified cases where mentors tended to nurture those mentees who were in fact clones of themselves in terms of profile, personality and aspirations.

A second influential factor on the quality of mentoring is the position of the mentor in their professional life or '*phase in professional life*' (Sikes, 1992),

Huberman (1989), in his study of Swiss teachers charted the professional life cycle of teachers and discovered that teachers' dispositions changed as they moved through their professional lifecycles. In Table 1 below, these phases are described in detail:

Number of years teaching	Career lifecycle phase
1-3 years:	**Career entry:** Painful or easy beginnings; survival, discovery, reality shock.
4-6 years:	**Stabilisation**: Taking on adult responsibilities; making a commitment to a defined professional goal; giving up other options
7-18 years:	**Experimentation/Activism**: Experimenting with different materials, student groupings, sequencing; attempts to make institutional changes.
7-18 years:	**Reassessment/Self-doubts**: Growing sense of monotony; thoughts of leaving teaching; realizing that other careers will have to be ruled out if they do not move quickly.
19-30 years:	**Serenity/Relational Distance:** More mechanical, relaxed, self-accepting
19-30 years:	**Conservatism**: Resistance to innovation, nostalgia for the past; concern with holding on to what one has rather than with getting what one wants.
31-40 years:	**Disengagement**: Disengaging from investment in work; serene or bitter.

Table 1: Professional Career Cycle of Teachers (Huberman, 1989)

Huberman (1989) explained that career development was not linear but was iterative and recursive with some teachers never experiencing stabilisation. Professional development is affected by social and maturational factors (Lewin, 1954) and the teacher may oscillate between phases. Clearly, it is important to select mentors at the 'experimentation/activism' phase to harness

the potential energy of the teacher as mentor. It appears to be more risky to select teachers at the 'reassessment/self-doubts' phase, in the hope that they may be re-energised and move to the 'experimentation/ activism' phase once more.

Clearly, the consideration of both (a) the mentor and mentee phase of personal life (Levinson, 1978) and (b) the mentor's phase of professional life (Sikes, 1992) has implications for how mentor and mentees are matched. Such matches may be initiated by the mentor, the mentee or a third party. In the case of teacher education in Ireland, the latter is the case as Greendale University assigned the PETE students to particular schools and, by default, an untrained mentor or cooperating teacher therein. Therefore, mentors are assigned on the basis of availability rather than suitability (Fenwick, 1999) and matching mentor to mentee in relation to 'goodness of fit' (Germain & Gitterman, 1987) is not considered. This matter is discussed in more detail in Chapter Twelve. It is interesting to note that, regardless of how the mentor-mentee relationship is formed, power issues must be considered.

Power and Mentoring

It has been suggested that mentoring is an almost ideal educational strategy in ITE which is widely accepted and apolitical (Gulam & Zulfiqar, 1998). However, some have put forward negative theories of mentoring (O'Leary & Mitchell, 1990; Wunsch, 1994). Central to such criticisms is the identification of power relationships in mentorship. For example, it is argued that the issue of power remains an inherent part of any form of mentoring and portraying it:

> *As an innocent, neutral practice serves only to mask the very real and inescapable role that power plays* (Manathunga, 2007, p.208).

Using the notion of subjectivities or technologies of self (Foucault, 1988), Devos (2004) describes mentoring as:

> *A site of governmentality...an intersection of the techniques of self and of control by others where [paradoxically], we act upon ourselves and invite and allow another to act upon us... where we assume simultaneously subject positions of she who is in control and career oriented, and she who is to be taken in hand and who may be needy at times* (p.78).

Such notions, challenge the idea that the mentor is autonomous and rational (Johnson, Lee, & Green, 2000, p.143) engaged with the mentee as *"co-*

learners in a voyage of discovery" (Patton et al., 2005). In fact, the mentor is often cast as the august and powerful master or guru and the student as the obedient and devoted apprentice or mentee (Giblett, 1992). Mentoring, by its very nature, includes both "*a form of paternalism and . . . supported self-direction*" (Devos, 2004, p. 77). More than this, in ITE, the mentor is actively engaged in surveillance, assessing mentee progress. Inevitably, the power dynamics inherent in the mentor-mentee relationship may lead to a struggle for control developing between the mentor and the mentee (Otto, 1994). The reasons for such a power struggle are manifold and typically centre on mutual respect, mentor investment and mentee work ethic. In addition, McCullick (2001) identifies misunderstandings regarding role definition, the process of learning to teach and expectations as contributors to mentor-mentee conflicts. This has implications for how mentors are selected and trained to deal with such issues.

Mentor Training

Hynes-Dussel (1999) asserts that all teacher educators must have a shared vision of teacher education. Therefore, mentors must work in partnership with university tutors to develop and implement the teacher education programme. Currently, mentor selection can be a haphazard process as mentors are selected on the basis of (a) being excellent classroom teachers, even though some do not have the potential to be effective mentors (Fletcher, 1998; Tannehill & Goc-Carp, 1992) or (b) being available rather than suitable (Fletcher, 1998). Coupled with this, formal mentor training programmes may not exist even though studies identify a need for serious on-going mentor training (Hardy, 1999; Rikard & Veale, 1996). It is argued that such training programmes should contain the following approaches: role-modeling, observation, data collection and feedback-focused analysis (Metzler, 1990; Randall, 1992) underpinned by a strong reflective purpose (Korthagen, 2001). In this way the mentor will be equipped to address issues of power and the effect of phases of personal and professional life in the mentor-mentee relationship. In addition, Stroot, Kiel, Stedman, Lohr, Faust & Schincariol-Randal (1998) espoused that, through training, successful mentors developed fertile and complex PCK and also had strong listening and communication skills with which to motivate and emotionally support the mentee. Such

mentors also learn to develop abstract thinking, expertise and commitment to teaching (Glickman et al., 2001) in all mentees not just those who appear to be 'clones' (Blackburn et al., 1981).

Conclusion

This chapter has explored the mentor-mentee relationship in detail investigating the range of types, models, styles of mentoring and characteristics of ideal mentors. It has also focused on the benefits and disadvantages of mentorship to both the mentor and mentee. Clearly, mentoring is an elusive term for which there is no commonly accepted definition. There is no *"single animal called mentoring but a collection of tasks associated with the role"* (Roberts, 2000, p.162). Mentoring is often defined in relation to styles and types of relationships and to variations in perceived benefits of mentoring and mentorship (Patton et al., 2005). In addition, mentoring is a process which is inherently political, as often mentors in ITE are cast as assessors of mentee (PETE student) performance in TP. In the next chapter, the policies and practices of international models of ITE are discussed, particularly scrutinizing TP, with an emphasis on (a) how mentoring is valued within these models and (b) the inherent learning theories which underpin such ITE programmes.

Chapter Four: Teacher Education: Policy and Practice

Introduction

This chapter addresses the following research questions:

Sub-question 4: Which learning theories underpin ITE supervision models?

Sub-question 5: What are the theoretical underpinnings of the current model of TP supervision with the Grad Dip at Greendale University?

This chapter begins with an analysis of the evolution of the global 'knowledge-based economy' (Drucker, 1992) and how this impacts on the role of the teacher in society. This analysis is then used as a lens to interrogate the policies and practices of teacher education programmes across the world with a particular emphasis on Ireland. In addition, the chapter uses the knowledge gained in the previous two chapters, to comment on the learning theories which underpin the ITE programmes under scrutiny. It is intended that the reader can then gauge how the Irish ITE system currently prepares student teachers for professional practice and the 'knowledge based economy' (Drucker, 1992). Taking a progressive focus from global policies to national policies and practices in ITE, it is intended that this chapter will help the reader to understand the construction of ITE in Ireland and its location in an international context.

A Knowledge-based Economy

> *Globalisation of the economy is having interpenetrating effects on the movement of capital, labour and knowledge...giving rise to more intense international competitiveness and puts a premium on human resource development* (Coolahan, 2003b, p.1).

Globalisation and its effects have led to the development of what has been termed the 'knowledge-based economy' (Drucker, 1992). This development has a direct and lasting impact on how people live and work, increasing the gap between rich and poor, between those who *"know and can do and those who don't know and can't do"* (Coolahan, 2003b, p.2). As a result, the world is experiencing key social changes centring around the institution of the family,

demographics and multiculturalism (ibid, p.2). The European Union (EU) acknowledges that striving for a knowledge-based economy can have detrimental effects:

> *On the downside, there are considerable risks and uncertainties associated with the knowledge-based society, as it threatens to bring about greater inequalities and social exclusion...almost 150 million people in the EU...face a higher risk of marginalisation* (European Union, 2001, p.6).

In this context, the teaching profession is seen as a "*key mediating agency for society*" (Coolahan, 2003b, p.27). Moreover, because the teacher is the most significant resource in schools (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2005) there is an expectation that the school and its teachers will respond to current social changes in a number of ways, by recognising:

> *Different languages and student backgrounds, to be sensitive to culture and gender issues, to promote tolerance and social cohesion, to respond effectively to disadvantaged students and students with learning or behavioural problems, to use new technologies, and to keep pace with rapidly developing fields of knowledge and approaches to student assessment* (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 2005, p.9).

It has been argued that these fundamental changes call for a renegotiation of teacher professionalism (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Tozer & Horsley, 2006) which has imperatives for all teachers, who must rethink their roles if they are to retain the confidence of society. Kirk & Broadhead (2007) paint a compelling view of the teacher's role as being:

> *Professionally accountable for their contribution to improving the outcomes for children, in terms of their basic needs; they will require to display a deeper sensitivity and responsiveness to the wellbeing of learners; they will work in schools...[which] will become gateways to a network of dispersed learning opportunities, and will draw on wider sources of expertise to support learning; they will have a stronger involvement with parents and other community agencies than in the past; they will be members of teams, in some cases in leadership roles, in others as partners, in addressing shared professional problems; and they will be expected to engage more frequently in discussions with others from different walks of professional life* (Kirk & Broadhead, 2007, p.11).

Across the world many nations have embraced the principles of the 'knowledge-based economy' (Drucker, 1992); for example, Europe, Ireland, the United Kingdom (UK), the United States (US), Japan and Australia. Sharing the view that the teaching profession is the lynchpin of such a society,

these nations view teachers as having a dual role in educating citizens for employment and, also, to cope with the societal changes that such an economy might bring. This has given rise to a global reform movement in education which has had significant implications for the ways in which teachers are educated and are expected to perform (Fullan, 2005; Teddie & Reynolds, 2000). Each of these countries will be examined in relation to how the principle of a 'knowledge-based economy' (Drucker, 1992) has influenced its teacher education policy.

Europe

In Europe, the reform movement in education has been kindled through the EU agencies: European Commission (EC) and the The Thematic Network on Teacher Education (TNTEE). The TNTEE (2000) outlines the importance of teachers:

> *High quality teachers and teacher education are central components, within a heterogenous pool of measures necessary to make high quality education and training and a "Europe of Knowledge" a reality* (p.2).

'The Lisbon Agenda: Education and Training Systems 2010 Work Programme' identifies three principal contributors to the effectiveness of education and training in Europe:

> (a) *A **high standard of entry into teacher training and teacher pre-service programmes**...priority to maintain the attractiveness of the profession in terms of pay, conditions, career progression and professional support*
> (b) *A national curriculum*
> (c) *Support services for resourcing, professional development, psychological, learning and ancillary supports*
>
> (my emphasis, Department of Education and Science, 2006, p.11).

Ireland

The Irish Government recognises that, since Ireland is a small open economy, it is heavily dependent on inward investment for its sustained economic growth, therefore:

> *The development of human capital is a key element in securing the country's continuing economic progress...[with] the overall goal of enhancing and modernising education and training* (Department of Education and Science, 2006, p.2).

Reflecting this belief, the current Irish Programme for Government 2007-2012 identifies:

> *Education as central to achieving...goals of protecting and growing Ireland's prosperity and ensuring greater social inclusion* (Ahern, Sargent, & Harney, 2007, p.42).

One outcome of this is that the government is committing an additional €350 million per year on new service developments in education, focusing specifically on the recruitment of teachers and teacher training. The Irish government is committed to:

> ***Reform the Initial teacher-training programmes**, to ensure that all teacher-training colleges reserve places for students from disadvantaged areas, and prioritise high quality in-career professional development for teachers and principals* (my emphasis, ibid, p.42).

United Kingdom

Like Ireland, the UK embraces the ideology of the 'knowledge-based economy' (Drucker, 1992), but has focused on counteracting the fall-out of such an economy by launching an education policy called Every Child Matters (ECM) in 2003. The policy is underpinned by the Children's Act (2004) and it aims to ensure that children (1) Be healthy, (2) Stay safe (3) Enjoy and achieve (4) Make a positive contribution (5) Achieve economic well-being (Department for Children Schools and Families, 2008). Kirk & Broadhead, (2007) point out that ECM was founded in direct response to the tragic death of a child, Victoria Climbié, who died at the hands of her guardians. Furthermore, they argue that ECM and the equivalent documents in Scotland (Getting It Right for Every Child: Proposals for Action), Northern Ireland (Our Children and Young people - Our Pledge), and Wales (The Learning Country) attempt to address concerns about the effects of major social change to a knowledge-based economy:

> *The incidence of truancy, of children living in poverty, of ill-health, of mental illness, of offending and re-offending, of teenage pregnancy of drug-abuse, of non-involvement in education and training post-16, and of children who are the victims of crime. They pointed to the growing gap in achievement between young people from different socio-economic backgrounds, to significant under-privilege and disadvantage, and to social exclusion and social malaise on an unacceptable scale* (Kirk & Broadhead, 2007, p.7).

United States

Interestingly, in the United States (US) similar educational reforms have been introduced. On 8th January 2002, President George W. Bush signed the 'The

No Child Left Behind Act' (NCLB). This was hailed as a *"landmark in education reform designed to improve student achievement and close achievement gaps"* (United States Department of Education, 2004, p.1). As President Bush expressed it: *"too many of our neediest children are being left behind"* (ibid, p.1). Thus, the NCLB law represents:

> *A sweeping overhaul of federal efforts to support elementary and secondary education in the US. It is built on four common-sense pillars: accountability for results, an emphasis on doing what works based on scientific research, expanded parental options, and expanded local control and flexibility* (ibid, p.1).

The US federal government has identified the teacher as the agent for change in its plans and has introduced the 'Improving Teacher Quality' State Grants Programme which provides professional development for teachers that is *"relevant, useful and focused on raising student achievement"* (United States Department of Education, 2004, p.5). According to President Bush:

> *A well-prepared teacher is vitally important to a child's education, and No Child Left Behind helps ensure that students are taught by highly qualified teachers* (Bush, 2004, p.5).

Japan

In Japan, in 2005, the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science (MEXT) developed a White Paper on Education, Culture, Sports Science and Technology, again with the view to embracing a 'knowledge-based economy' (Drucker, 1992). This document identified the professional teacher as a lynchpin in policy:

> *To maintain economic and social vitality and build a society where children can embrace their dreams and hopes and cultivate their future, it is necessary to position education as the most important political task and steadily promote educational reform to improve human resources as a national strategy* (Ministry for Education Culture Sports Science and Technology (MEXT), 2005, p.1).

Overall, this plan responds to issues such as educational stagnation, an increase in unemployment, economic difficulties, and changes in demographics. Japan has the world's fastest growing elderly population and there is a widespread breakdown of the family unit. According to Johnson, (2002) the optimal way to overcome Japan's social problems and secure strong social and economic development for the nation is: *"by bringing schools into closer contact with families, communities and industries"* (p.1).

Recognising this, Japanese education has been reformed and now emphasises individual agency to foster (1) robust Japanese citizens that possess self-initiative, (2) top-level talents that will lead the 'century of knowledge' (3) Japanese citizens who will inherit and create an emotionally enriched culture and society, and (4) Japanese citizens educated to live in the international community. Within this remit, teachers have a dual role as pastor and task-master; to deliver both their subjects and also moral education termed *"kokoro no kyoiku"* which means education of the heart (ibid, p.1).

Australia

Turning to Australia, once again the difficulties of changes in the family unit and demographic changes, such as an aging population and multiculturalism, have determined how the country embraces the knowledge-based economy (Skilbeck & Connell, 2003). The Government believes that sustained innovation is the key to future growth and prosperity in a competitive global economy (Committee for the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education, 2003). In addition, the Government asserts that building a culture of continuous innovation through education is an essential requirement, parallel to and supporting research and development. They argue that schools, families and businesses have a fundamental role in this innovation. The government also contends that:

> *Innovation in the knowledge economy is not confined to a small group of specialists. It must be supported by a highly educated workforce and citizenry* (ibid, p.1).

Thus, Australia identifies that:

> *Teachers are the key to mobilising schools for innovation...needed in a rapidly changing, knowledge-driven, globalising world* (ibid, p.1).

All of the countries, cited above, appear to have embraced the concept of a 'knowledge-based economy'(Drucker, 1992) and have developed educational policies which look to schools and teachers to address the emerging issues, concerns and skills/knowledge gaps. It can be argued, therefore, that in the role of mediator, the 21st century teacher will need to be accountable to child, parent and community, will need to forge meaningful relationships with a variety of communities of practice and become life-long learners committed to on-going professional development. Clearly, in this scenario, the seeds for a new view of professionalism must be sown during ITE.

The Profession of Teaching

The following extract seems to capture not only the complexities of teaching, but also, the potential power of the teacher:

> *To a music lover, watching a concert from the audience, it would be easy to believe that the conductor has one of the easiest jobs in the world. There he stands, waving his arms in time with the music, and the orchestra produces glorious sounds, to all appearances, quite spontaneously. Hidden, from the audience – especially from the musical novice - are the conductor's abilities to read and interpret all of the parts at once, to play several instruments and understand the capacities of many more, to organize and coordinate the disparate parts, to motivate and communicate with all of the orchestra members. The same way that conducting looks like hand-waving to the uninitiated, teaching looks simple from the perspective of the students who see a person talking, listening, handing out papers, and giving assignments. Invisible in both these performances are the many kinds of knowledge, unseen plans, and back-stage moves - the skunkworks, if you will, that allow a teacher to purposefully move a group of students from one set of understandings and skills to quite another over the space of many months.*
>
> *On a daily basis, teachers confront complex decisions that rely on many different kinds of knowledge and judgments that can involve high-stakes outcomes for students' futures. To make good decisions, teachers must be aware of the many ways in which student learning can unfold in the context of development, learning differences, language and cultural influences, and individual temperaments, interests and approaches to learning. In addition to foundational knowledge about the areas of learning and performance, teachers need to know how to take the steps necessary to gather additional information that will allow them to make more grounded judgments about what is going on and what strategies may be helpful. Above all, teachers need to keep what is best for children at the centre of their decision making. This sounds like a simple point but it is a complex matter, that has profound implications for what happens to and for many children in school* (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005, p1-2)

Armour, Makopoulou & Chambers (2007) emphasise the potential impact of one teacher, by inviting the reader to calculate the number of pupils that each physical education teacher encounters through a career in physical education, assuming, for example, that there are approximately thirty pupils in a class, twenty to thirty lessons taught each week, for approximately thirty-five weeks per year. Therefore, over a thirty-five year career, a teacher will teach literally thousands of children and has the potential to have a pivotal influence on

every child that s/he teaches, shaping every child in his/her care. This could be regarded as a grave professional responsibility for every teacher. Clearly, therefore, teacher education programmes have an imperative to produce effective teachers who can deliver this remit. Dewey spoke of this in 1929, saying that teachers needed to be empowered to embrace the complexity of teaching and not to resort to, as Darling Hammond (1998) puts it, *"simplistic formulas or cookie-cutter routines"* (p.7). Currently, as was illustrated earlier, there is a renewed emphasis on the responsibility of the teaching profession to prepare children who can thrive as adults in a knowledge economy:

> *Around the world, the importance of education to individual and societal success has increased at a breathtaking pace as a new knowledge-based economy has emerged. As a consequence, most countries have been engaged in intensive reforms of their education systems, and many have focused especially on improving teacher preparation, recognizing that developing accomplished teachers who can effectively teach a wide array of learners to high standards is essential to their economic and political survival* (Darling-Hammond, 2005, p.237).

Clearly, teacher education plays a fundamental role in equipping teachers for their role; hence the need to understand how student teachers can learn most effectively in teacher education.

Teacher Professional Development

Coolahan (2004) argues that teacher professional development takes place in three stages referred to as the '3 I's'. The '3 I's' refer to Initial Teacher Education, Induction and In-service training. In-service training is also referred to as continuous professional development (CPD). This study focuses on the first 'I', Initial Teacher Education (ITE), in Ireland, and looks particularly at teaching practice (TP), as a key element of ITE. Scanning the literature on teacher education, the first 'I', Initial Teacher Education, is also termed as teacher preparation, pre-service education, or initial teacher training. However, throughout this thesis, it is referred to as initial teacher education (ITE).

According to the US National Academy of Education (NAed) Committee on Teacher Education (2006), typically, an ITE programme comprises three overlapping areas of knowledge which are universal to many statements of standards of teaching across the globe:

1. Knowledge of learners and how they learn and develop within social contexts, including knowledge of language development;
2. Understanding of curriculum content and goals, including the subject matter and skills to be taught in light of disciplinary demands, student needs, and the social purposes of education; and
3. Understanding of and skills for teaching, including content pedagogical knowledge and knowledge for teaching diverse learners, as these are informed by an understanding of assessment and of how to construct and manage a productive classroom (Darling-Hammond, 2006a, p.305).

In addition to these three areas of knowledge, effective ITE programmes possess a range of key characteristics. A study by Darling-Hammond (2006b), examined seven exemplary ITE programmes in the United States (US) in a range of contexts: public and private settings, undergraduate and graduate qualifications, and large and small universities. This study found that these seven ITE programmes produced graduates who were extraordinarily well prepared from their first days in the classroom, and found that despite superficial differences, the programmes had common features, including:

- *A common, clear vision of good teaching that permeates all coursework and clinical experiences, creating a coherent set of learning experiences;*
- *Well-defined standards of professional practice and performance that are used to guide and evaluate course work and clinical work;*
- *A strong core curriculum taught in the context of practice and grounded in knowledge of child and adolescent development and learning, an understanding of social and cultural contexts, curriculum, assessment, and subject matter pedagogy;*
- ***Extended clinical experiences—at least 30 weeks of supervised practicum and student teaching opportunities in each programme—that are carefully chosen to support the ideas presented in simultaneous, closely interwoven course work;***
- *Extensive use of case methods, teacher research, performance assessments, and portfolio evaluation that apply learning to real problems of practice;*
- *Explicit strategies to help students to confront their own deep-seated beliefs and assumptions about learning and students and to learn about the experiences of people different from themselves;*

- *Strong relationships, common knowledge, and shared beliefs among school and university-based faculty jointly engaged in transforming teaching, schooling and teacher education*

(my emphasis, Darling-Hammond, 2006b, p.305).

Brouwer and Korthagen (2005) concur with Darling-Hammond on this and, of specific interest to this research, comment on the quality of clinical experiences (teaching practice) in an ITE programme. In their longitudinal study of 370 student teachers in the Netherlands, they concluded that there are three features of any teaching practice model which are crucial for integrating practice and theory:

- Cyclical programing of college-based and student teaching periods
- Supporting individual learning processes
- Intensive cooperation between teacher educators

Lewin (2004) adds to this, pointing out that having a *"constructive supportive and enlightening"* TP experience depends on four key factors:

(a) How it is organised and supported,
(b) The mechanism of fusing theory with practice,
(c) Visits of university tutors (in the absence of trained mentors)
(d) Timing and duration of Teaching practice (TP)

(p.12).

Dealing with each of Lewin's (2004) factors, it is important that the TP occurs in schools that exhibit best practice and where student teachers are supported by well-trained mentors. It is also crucial that the university maintains constant contact and support with the student teacher and his/her school mentor. It is equally important that TP and university based sessions are cyclical and of reasonable length such that theory and practice may be integrated. This is in opposition to a 'technical rationality' model (Schon, 1983), where theory and practice are taught and learned largely separately.

In reality, it seems clear that the characteristics of effective ITE identified by Darling-Hammond, Brouwer & Korthagen and Lewin are not always evident in ITE programmes. Yet, the 'rub between theory and practice' (Miller & Silvernail, 1994) which:

> *Occurs most productively when questions arise in the context of real students and work in progress, and where research and disciplined inquiry are also at hand is not always present* (Darling-Hammond, 1998, p.6).

Although it seems clear that TP ought to be at the heart of the ITE experience, Neville, Sherman & Cohen (2005) describe clinical experiences as *"limited, disconnected from university coursework and inconsistent"* (p.13). One explanation for this might be financial constraints which limit university-funding for mentor selection, training and employment (Skilbeck & Connell, 2003). Another reason suggested is poor relationships between schools and universities, with divergent expectations by student teachers and misunderstandings regarding the role of school and university in the process (McCullick, 2001). It might be helpful, at this point, to scrutinise a range of models of TP across the world to (a) ascertain whether there is a link between university based and school based experiences in ITE (b) establish the learning theory underpinning the TP experience in each case. In so doing, it is intended that the reader can judge how the model of TP in Ireland is positioned in relation to other countries.

Models of TP Worldwide and related Learning Theories

In this section a large cross-section of international ITE models are scrutinised in relation to the connection between theory and practice and the learning theories which inform them. These include: France, Germany, Ireland, The Netherlands, UK, US, Australia, Asia (Japan, Taiwan, Chinese Taipei), Africa (Ghana, Lesotho, Malawi), South Africa, The West Indies (Trinidad and Tobago). In each case the learning theory underpinning the model is identified.

France

In France, all candidates now complete a two-year graduate programme in newly created University Institutes for the Preparation of Teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2005). Officially, these are called University Institutes for Teachers' Training (IUFM) and are connected to nearby schools. According to the 2003 OECD Report on France, during their first year of training at the IUFM, students prepare a *concours* comprising examinations focusing nearly exclusively on scientific aspects and on the didactics of a particular discipline (Cros & Obin, 2003). This report also outlines that on passing the *concours,*

student teachers then begin to learn about the practicalities of teaching during a sandwich programme which cycles between university and school. During this time, student teachers are on placement and are monitored by both University teacher trainers and school-based Pedagogical Advisors or mentors. Pedagogical Advisors are effectively Master teachers appointed by the Inspector of national education. Grading of TP is carried out by Institute Teacher Trainers. The ITE system in France embraces a situated learning perspective and values trained mentors who support student teacher learning. Therefore clinical and university practices are closely linked to foster a more meaningful ITE experience for student teachers. Clearly, school and universities are partners in the process of TP.

Germany

TP in Germany takes place in separate teacher education centres, which are not attached to a university, and also in partnership schools (Jones, 2000). There are two phases of TP. In phase one, student teachers spend two and a half days a week in school and two at the teacher training centre. In phase two, student teachers spend four days in school on a reduced timetable and one at the teacher education centre. Student teachers are placed in partnership schools, on their own, under the guidance of an untrained mentor. Teacher education centre tutors have responsiblility for TP evaluation, together with the partnership school head teacher, who will also submit a report and can observe any lesson. There is evidently a strong partnership between school and university teacher educators. The model of ITE in Germany demonstrates a situated view of learning but, interestingly, does not place a high value on the importance of trained mentors or the input of mentors in the assessment process. This may dilute the learning experience for student teachers.

Ireland

ITE in Ireland takes place within university and school settings employing two models of ITE: concurrent and consecutive. In the consecutive model, the student attains a Bachelor's degree in chosen subjects over a three or four year term and completes a further one or two-year post-graduate teacher education qualification. Within the concurrent model, the student teacher

completes a four-year Bachelor's degree programme where university tuition and school-based teaching practice (clinical practice) are combined. All disciplines, with the exception of PE, Materials Technology (Wood), Metalwork and Science use a consecutive model. PE student teachers typically engage in a concurrent four-year degree programme using a 'block TP model' (Coolahan, 2003a). Student teachers have blocks of TP in each year. In years one and four the student teacher is alone but in year two, dyads of students are assigned to schools. University's retain control over students in-school experiences; placement, guidance, supervision and assessment. Schools are requested by the university to cooperate with the TP process on an ad hoc, voluntary basis. The drawbacks of this system are twofold: teachers are untrained as mentors in schools and the school mentor or school principal has no official role in assessment. Therefore, wide variations exist within school cultures and also regarding advice received by students teachers on TP (McWilliams et al., 2006, p.73)

ITE in Ireland is tentatively embracing the concept of mentoring. There have been three key developments in this regard in the past eight years: The Lucent Science Teacher's Initiative, The Masters of Education in Educational Mentoring and The National Pilot Programme in Teacher Induction (see Chapter One, p.2-3). However, it is interesting to note that the Irish Government has yet to make a strong commitment to mentoring in teacher education and implement a formal nation-wide policy. The government's position is perhaps influenced by the Teacher Unions who have vetoed formal mentoring in ITE. These Unions request that if teachers become mentors, they must be paid for this or given time in lieu for their mentoring duties. Therefore, a rather haphazard situation remains where the choice of whether to train as a mentor teacher is left largely to the individual teacher, and is subject to the permission of the School Principal (teachers must be released from their schools to participate in the programme). Because of this situation, a dual system exists with formal mentoring and informal mentoring operating side by side in ITE. The majority of ITE programmes subscribe to informal mentoring where cooperating teachers support student teacher learning during TP, but are untrained and unpaid to do so (McWilliams et al., 2006). An example of such a programme is the Grad Dip in Greendale University, at the

heart of this research. In addition to this, similar to African countries, in most ITE programmes, there is no formal working relationship between the cooperating teacher and the university tutor. In addition the assessment is carried out solely by the university tutor with no consultation with the school principal and cooperating teacher. Therefore schools and universities do not form a strong partnership during TP (ibid). It seems, therefore, in Ireland, that the learning theory underpinning many ITE programmes is a cognitive model, where thinking and learning are viewed as skills, the effectiveness of which is determined by individuals' innate cognitive structures.

Netherlands

Brouwer & Korthagen (2005) undertook a longitudinal study of teacher education in the Netherlands. In the teacher education model studied, TP occured in a sequence of four cycles (preparation/observation/one-day-per-week teaching/seven-week block of teaching). The bridge between each school-based stage was a college-based period which encouraged a fusion between theory and practice (Lewin, 2004). A triad of student teachers was placed in each school to facilitate opportunities to observe, feedback and try out new ideas. Each triad was linked with a trained cooperating teacher who mentored the triad, using a clinical supervision format, and analysed each lesson to encourage reflection. There was constant contact between university tutors and cooperating teachers to ensure coordination of activities in the university and the teaching practice school and, also, to share the types of learning processes occuring in both institutions. The view of learning that appears to underpin this model of TP is a situated theory of learning embracing community of practice (Wenger, 1998) and legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991). The cooperating teacher (mentor), as an old-timer, brings the student teacher (newcomer) to the core of the community of practice. Clearly, as noted earlier, through the situated lens, learning is viewed as an integral part of generative social practice focusing on the student teacher acting in the school setting. Thus, as Harris (2000) suggests, the student teacher acts within the environment rather than on it.

UK

According to the Training and Development Agency for Schools (TDA) (2008), in the UK, ITE is conducted using both consecutive and concurrent models. In the more common consecutive model, students complete a three-year degree and then advance to a one-year post-graduate qualification in teaching. This year is typically broken down into two phases using a cyclical approach to TP where the student teacher moves between school and university allowing a fusion of theory and practice. Each university is linked to Partner Schools (PS). Each PS is remunerated for its involvement in the programme, therefore, every PS has an ITE coordinator who supervises ITE in the school and has the responsibility to ensure that high quality teacher training occurs. The role includes coordinating subject mentors, linking them with the students and ensuring that quality mentoring is in place. Student teachers are commonly placed in pairs in schools during TP. The university visiting tutor monitors the quality of the school's teacher training programme, including overseeing mentoring standards. He/she will also evaluate the student formally in consultation with the subject mentor and the students themselves. This ITE model is rooted in situated learning theory fostering a communities of practice (Wenger, 1998) and legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991) approach. Here, mentors are trained to support student teacher learning during TP.

US

In the US, according to Darling-Hammond (2005), recent educational reforms have lead to some very significant changes. Darling-Hammond found that more than three-hundred schools of education had created programmes that move away from traditional four-year bachelors degree programmes, encompassing more clinical practice of disciplines and education coursework into the school-setting. These extended programmes are of varying duration and include one or two year graduate programmes or five-year models. In the five-year model, students engage exclusively in clinical practice, or TP, during the final year combining practice with coursework (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF), 1996). There are two forms of clinical practice (TP) offered (a) Professional Development Schools and (b) The Clinical Master Teacher Programme. Since the 1980s, many of the

programmes have been partnered with local school districts to create purposeful professional development schools (PDS) akin to teaching hospitals in medicine (Lombardi, 2001). These sites foster professional development and research amongst teachers. Some advanced versions of these facilities provide programmes that are jointly planned and taught by both school-based faculty and university-based faculty. PDS have a strong link with colleges and universities, producing newsletters and documents outlining best practice. Typically, groups of six to eight student teachers work with a mentor teacher using a coaching model. The cooperating teachers (mentors) teach prepracticum courses and mentor the student teacher in the school. The university tutors train the mentors, providing professional expertise. A second form of teacher preparation involves the Clinical Master Teacher Programme. In this model, the classroom teacher is the main supervisor during final TP and thus evaluates the student teacher. The cooperating teacher must apply formally to supervise student teachers, attend a one day mandatory training day at the university, have at least a master's degree, five years successful teaching, recommendation from the school principal and experience in supervising the triad model of supervision. Cooperating teachers form a team and link with a university liaison tutor. ITE in the US is underpinned by a strong reliance on mentors as partners in teacher education. In addition, it utilises a situated approach to learning believing that student teachers need to learn to teach within the school setting under the guidance of experienced and trained school mentors within a strong school-university partnership.

Australia

In Australia, teacher preparation is fore-grounded by Anderson's (1987) philosophy:

> *The challenge for teacher education is to foster commitment to school teaching and to prepare trainees for the reality of classroom practice, but at the same time to provide them with a broad general education, including the capacity to be critical and self-critical, and a familiarity with diverse viewpoints and experiences.*(p.63)

According to the OECD Report on Teacher Education in Australia (2003), this statement guides the direction of ITE in Australia. Across Australia, many new concurrent and consecutive pathways to teacher qualification have been developed. Steps have also been taken to forge strong partnerships between

clusters of schools and single universities during both ITE and teaching practice (clinical practice). Practicum requirements vary across these partnerships (Tasmanian Educational Leaders Institute, 2003). Supervising teachers (cooperating teachers) are paid a modest fee for mentoring student teachers which often is not reflective of the time and effort put in to training the student teacher and puts pressure on the Universities' budgets. More recently, some universities have appointed personnel who straddle both university and school i.e. adjunct staff. In addition, schools have been invited to take a more proactive role in designing, mentoring, supervising and grading student teachers. In spite of this development, there is a lack of consensus about just how large a role schools should play in TP. They are in partnership with universities but perhaps do not demonstrate a very strong liaison. Australia has situated learning and mentoring at the heart of its teacher education programme.

Asia

Across Asia, in Japan, Taiwan and Chinese Taipei, there is an established culture of mentoring in ITE. In 1989, Japanese teacher education was reformed to extend both university and school-based training (Johnson, 2002). Looking to Japan and Chinese Taipei, undergraduates complete up to four weeks of teaching practice in their final year under the supervision of a mentor. On obtaining teaching certification, new teachers complete a year-long supervised internship (induction) with a reduced teaching load that allows for mentoring and further study. The mentoring is conducted by Master teachers. According to Japanese law, first-year novice teachers have a minimum of twenty days of in-service training and sixty days of further professional development. Master teachers are released from their classrooms to advise, counsel and guide them. The aim is to establish an atmosphere of trust between novice teachers and experienced teachers. In both Japan and China, new teachers watch other teachers at length, discuss difficulties of practice, present and critique demonstration lessons, and, with groups of colleagues, imagine and act out how students might respond to certain presentations of material. Stigler and Stevenson (1991) observed:

> *[One of the] reasons Asian class lessons are so well crafted is that there is a very systematic effort to pass on the accumulated wisdom of teaching practice to each new generation of teachers and to keep perfecting that practice by providing teachers*

> *the opportunities to continually learn from each other. A growing number of teachers are working hard to bring these goals to fruition but are often hampered in their efforts by colleagues and administrators who are unenlightened or apathetic about the current and future needs of students* (p.13).

These Asian countries also embrace a culture of situated learning in their teacher education programmes and value the trained mentor, the school and university as partners in the teacher education process.

Africa and West Indies, South Africa

Lewin (2004) describes The Multi Site Teacher Education Research Project (MUSTER) which explored aspects of Initial Teacher Education (ITE) in five countries, Ghana, Lesotho, Malawi, Trinidad and Tobago and South Africa, over four years. He suggests that ITE is conducted under a number of key headings: the kind of knowledge and skills teacher education curricula seek to promote, perceptions of the effectiveness of training, and issues concerned with supply and demand and costs. TP varies across all of these countries. Training ranges from four-year undergraduate concurrent qualifications which include mentor-supervised TP, to post-graduate teaching qualifications with formal mentoring and in-service training. University tutors do tend to supervise TP but their visits were found to be *"badly timed, rushed, irregular, and mostly orientated to assessment"* (Lewin, 2004, p.13). In some cases there are no subsequent internships or probationary years. In some cases teacher training is not available and the student teacher learns:

> *On the job under the supervision of untrained mentors and receives certification based on experience and attendance at courses or distance learning support* (ibid).

Relationships between mentors and tutors are underdeveloped and considered weak. Equally, the potency of school and university partnerships appears to be varied, with the university exerting ultimate power over the assessment of student teachers. Across these countries there is a diversity in teacher education provision, from formal trained mentor support for student teachers which is underpinned by a situated view of learning to unsupervised learning 'on the job' in which a more cognitivist view is apparent.

While consensus exists in the majority of countries, regarding how situated learning theories and the apprenticeship model should underpin teacher education programmes, there continues to be a diverse range of teacher

education provision worldwide. It seems that while governments across the world endorse the 'knowledge economy' (Drucker, 1992) in policy, placing teachers as pivotal in the roll-out of this agenda, in some countries e.g. Ireland, this does not translate into tangible policy support of ITE provision and practice.

Conclusion

This chapter has illustrated the ways in which the global spotlight is firmly trained on the teaching profession, hoping it will deal with aspects of the societal upheaval, such as changes in family unit, demographics and multiculturalism (Coolahan, 2003b), arising from the rise of the knowledge-based economy (Drucker, 1992). This is clearly evident in many of the government policies outlined, where education and the training of teachers have been placed at the top of national agendas. These expectations clearly have implications for the teaching profession, not only in terms of the changing role of the teacher, but how teachers are trained to fulfil this remit through each of the Coolahan's (2003a) '3 I's' (ITE, Induction and Inservice). As ITE is the first stage in this process, it has a foundational role in preparing teachers for their changing responsibilities. Within ITE, TP provides an opportunity to put theory into practice under the guidance of school and university partnerships and is an essential part of the ITE process (Behets & Vergauwen, 2006).

In addition, this chapter has analysed ITE, and its inherent TP, in a number of countries worldwide. The majority of these countries acknowledge that school-university partnerships are the foundation for effective TP (McCullick, 2001) with the cooperating teacher as trained mentor central to this liaison (Stroot et al., 1998). Ireland is an exception to this as often PETE students identify a discrepancy in the quality of support from the CTs and the UTs. This is due to a number of key factors (a) untrained mentors in schools who are not given adequate time to fulfil their mentoring duties and (b) the unclarified role of the school and university personnel in relation to support and assessment on TP which can lead to conflict (McCullick, 2001). Kahan (1999) asserts that such conflict effects the quality of learning support given to PETE students. In order to show how the literature review in Chapters Two, Three and Four

have informed the derivation of the main research questions in this study, the next chapter focuses on PETE specifically highlighting the current literature in relation to learning and mentoring.

Chapter Five: Teacher Learning in Physical Education

Introduction

Simons (1993) suggests that effective learning is most likely to occur if the conditions are self-regulated, intrinsically motivated, discovery oriented, contextual, problem oriented, case based, and social. From a social constructivist perspective, Kirk and Macdonald (1998) define learning as *"an active and creative process involving an individual's interaction with their physical environment and with other learners"* (p.377). In the recent literature there is a strong emphasis on social or collaborative learning. Learning can be either formal or informal. Werthner and Trudel, (2006) describe how formal learning is directed by another person and how informal learning implies that the learner chooses what to learn. It seems that teachers tend to value informal learning with and from each other (Armour & Yelling, 2007). This may be related to the fact that the learning is relevant to their context and thus becomes more valuable to them.

Teaching Practice in PETE

With the more recent understanding of learning shifting to a more social, situated and contextual view, the literature on PETE programmes suggests that TP, or clinical experience is a central aspect of quality PETE programmes (Behets & Vergauwen, 2006). In spite of this, TP placement is often based on convenience rather than other considerations with schools sometimes providing difficult contexts for the PETE student e.g. poor facilities, untrained mentors (McIntyre et al., 1996). It is through TP that the PETE student learns the 'rub between theory and practice' solidifying teacher' professional knowledge, encompassed in the generic term PCK (Amade-Escot, 2000). McCullick (2001) emphasises the importance of teacher educators having a clear and shared understanding of the curriculum of ITE and their role in promoting this on TP. Clearly, the process of TP and indeed ITE needs to be based on a clear understanding of how pupils learn (O'Sullivan, 2003). This is an area which needs to be addressed in the literature. There appears to be a continued lack of consensus regarding the length of the TP experience (ibid)

with researchers reporting that it is the quality of the experience that is important and not the quantity (McIntyre et al., 1996). While the length of PETE TP varies across programmes, the elements typically inherent in the TP experience comprise the initial opportunity for the PETE student to observe expert teachers teaching, followed by teaching parts of lessons which progresses to the teaching of full lessons (Behets & Vergauwen, 2006). The CT (mentor) is a constant presence on TP helping the preparation, delivery of and reflection on lessons. The reflective element of TP is still widely considered to be a pivotal aspect which prepares PETE students for the unknown in their classrooms (Tsangaridou & Siedentop, 1995).

The Role of Mentoring in PE Teacher Learning

Mentoring in education is currently used as a key reform tool for improving schools by up-skilling teachers (Feiman-Nemser, 1996) and teacher educators (Dodds, 2005). A number of studies have extended the knowledge of PETE educators in the area of mentoring. There is a sustained view that of all teacher educators, the cooperating teacher (mentor) has the most significant influence on PETE students teaching (Coleman & Mitchell, 2000). Typical mentoring duties encompass pre-lesson planning, observation of the lesson and post lesson conferences which reflect on performance and deliberate on mentee focus for improvement (ibid). Overall, research continues to support the notion that mentoring style is context-dependent (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1993) and therefore idiosyncratic (Zanting et al., 2003). The research points to how the nature of mentoring PETE students is spiral in nature and aligned with Kram's (1985) phases of mentoring: intiation, cultivation, separation and redefinition. Typically, mentees can have multiple mentoring relationships which are defined by their personal and professional needs at a given point in time (ibid). A mentee can engage with the same mentor at differing times in his/her career (ibid). Rikard and Veale (1996) describe three distinctive styles of mentoring which are defined by the intensity of the mentor role: didactic, laissez-faire and collaborative. The focus of much of the research, to date, centres on the desired qualities of a mentor in PETE. Recent studies have revealed that ideal mentor qualities include feeling competent as a mentor i.e. having more sophisticated, relevant content knowledge, which is grounded through mentor training (McCaughtry,

Kulinna, Cothran, Martin, & Faust, 2005). Kay's (2004), research shows an increasing lack of empathy by some mentors towards some PETE students, who enter TP with a clear lack of PCK in games and gymnastics, (p.21). In order to circumvent this, in some jurisdictions, university tutors and mentors shape the TP experience for PETE students based on a joint audit of the PETE students' prior knowledge and training needs (Stidder & Hayes, 2006, p.334). More recently, Cothran et al's (2008) study of a specific mentoring programme for novice elementary PE teachers, revealed that often mentees wanted more directive guidance or 'quick-fix solutions', than the traditional reflective facilitation propagated by many mentoring programmes which positioned the mentor as 'knower' and the mentee as 'receiver'. Patton et al (2005) found that mentor-mentee relationships thrive when there is a 'goodness of fit' between the mentor and mentee, where the relationship is built on trust, synergy and reflection. This type of relationship empowers both the mentor and mentee and their constituent community of practice thus improving their teaching. In another study, student teachers mentioned specific aspects of their relationships with their mentors, or particular ways in which their mentors had helped them, including boosting their confidence, providing strategies and/or support for classroom management, 'being there/available', and offering guidance for managing time and workload (Malderez, Hobson, Tracey, & Kerr, 2007, p.233). For some student teachers, mentor-mentee relationships were dysfunctional and other teachers in the TP school bridged the gap by offering support (ibid). The fact that some mentors actively supported mentees and others withheld support, shows that mentors have varied understanding of their role (ibid).

Conclusion

Existing research in teacher education indicates what differing parties in the process want or identify as good practice. A glaring gap in the literature is the continued lack of clarity regarding the exact impact of mentoring on teacher learning (Ingersoll & Smith, 2004). This study attempts to redress the situation by analysing the process of mentoring in practice from the perspective of all the parties involved and, in particular, the impact on student learning in specific areas. The research is lead by the following questions:

Main Research Questions

1. How are PETE students supported to learn effectively during TP within the existing partnership model?
2. How do teacher-mentors and university tutors view their roles and the nature of learning within the current model of TP supervision?
3. What is the nature of the PETE student learning that takes place on TP?
4. How does school-based learning link to other strands of the teacher education programme in supporting student teacher competence?

Chapter Six: Research Methodology

Introduction

The previous four chapters have derived research questions relating to the nature and support of PETE learning on TP, how CTs and UTs percieve their roles in TP, how TP is positioned within ITE and teacher learning in physical education. In this chapter, the rationale and justification for the employment of qualitative methodologies to address these questions is reported. Cronbach (1980) argued that if a research report was transparent in its methodology, others could weigh up the reasonableness of the claims made and validate these themselves (pp. 195-196). In order to ensure this research process is as transparent as possible, the methodology chapter is organised as follows:

(a) The notion of research in general is explored, leading to an overview of both quantitative and qualitative research paradigms, taken from both historical and epistemological viewpoints.

(b) A critical discussion of specific data collection tools and data analysis strategies, illustrating the ways in which they were employed to address the key research questions.

(c) A personal critical analysis of the ways in which the researcher engaged with the research process, and learnt from it is included. This latter section is not intended to be a 'confessional', rather it is intended to help with transparency by giving the reader some additional insights into the key data collection tool; the researcher in action (Merriam et al., 2003). Krieger (1991) captures the relationship between researcher and research in this metaphor: *"The pot carries its maker's thoughts, feelings, and spirit. To overlook this fact is to miss a crucial truth, whether in clay, story, or science"* (p.89).

Research

> *To a raw experience we may either attach words or numbers...Numbers and words are both needed if we are to understand the world* (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p.40).

The first references to research-type activities were in the 5th century BC when the philosopher Empedocles, used various empirical demonstrations to argue against Parmenides. However, the etymology of the term research can be traced to 1539 when the term was first coined to mean the *"act of*

searching closely" evolving from the French verb *recherché* or *recercher* meaning to *"seek out, search closely"* and by 1639, the term had evolved into meaning *"scientific inquiry"* (Online Etymological Dictionary, 2008). The emergence of the term 'research', coincided with the urge to understand the world (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005c). At the beginning of the twentieth century, two key converging developments - the debate about the nature of knowledge and the power of the interventionist over laissez-faire government administration - gave rise to 'research' being understood as a special way of knowing, and it became a favoured and privileged form of public discourse that could challenge the beliefs of *"folk wisdom, custom, insight, intuition and dogma" and give rise to public action"* (Freebody, 2003 p.17). At its simplest, therefore, research is defined as a:

> *Detailed study of a subject, especially in order to discover (new) information or reach a (new) understanding* (Cambridge Dictionaries Online, 2008).

As research has evolved, two distinct paradigms have emerged: quantitative (numerical data) and qualitative (words, pictures, objects) research which have, at times, been engaged in a *"classic paradigm war"* (Neill, 2007, p.1). A paradigm is a basic set of beliefs that guide action and *"behind this term stands a personal biography of the researcher, who speaks from a particular class, gender, racial, cultural and community perspective"* (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005a, p.21). The four elements of paradigm are (a) ethics, which concerns morality, (b) epistemology, which describes the nature of knowledge, (c) ontology, is the study of beliefs in the social world and how they might be understood and (d) methodology, is the mechanism for acquiring knowledge of the world (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005b, p.183).

In the *"classic paradigm war"* (Neill, 2007, p.1), Kerlinger, commented that *"there was no such thing as qualitative data. Everything is either 1 or 0"* (Miles & Huberman, 1994 p.40). Berg (1989) refuted this by claiming that all data were basically qualitative. In contrast to these polarised viewpoints, Kaplan (1964) argued for the merits of both forms of research: *"qualities are of quantities and a measured quality has just the magnitude expressed in its measure"* (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p.41). Firestone (1987) made a similar point:

> *On the one hand quantitative studies 'persuade' the reader through de-emphasising individual judgement and stressing the use of established procedures leading to more precise and generalisable results. On the other hand, qualitative research persuades through rich depiction and strategic comparison across cases thereby overcoming the abstraction inherent in quantitative studies* (Miles & Huberman, 1994 p.41).

In order to adopt the most appropriate research approach for any research project, it seems essential to understand how different forms of research evolved, and why. To this end, the next section provides a cartography of research, by mapping the features and origins of quantitative and qualitative methodologies. This will be followed by a detailed analysis of qualitative research, in particular, tracking its evolution and justifying why this approach has been selected in order to address the research questions posed in this study.

Quantitative and Qualitative Research

> *The first step in conducting any research is to formulate a specific research problem and related research questions* (Minichiello, Aroni, Timewell, & Alexander, 1995, p.45).

Dobbin & Gatowski (1999) posit that it is imperative to realise that research can be accomplished by using a range of methods. The decisions around choice of paradigm(s) should be influenced by the purpose of the research (House, 1994; Minichiello et al., 1995; Tellis, 1997) and should:

> *Reflect assumptions about the social world, how science should be conducted, and what constitutes legitimate problems, solutions, and criteria of proof* (ibid, p.1).

In other words, the choice centres around questions of ethics, epistemology and ontology (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005b, p.183). Furthermore, the selection of a research approach/paradigm also influences the range and depth of:

> *Questions asked, the methods chosen, the statistical analyses used, the inferences made, and the ultimate goal of the research and should be based upon the problem of interest, resources available, the skills and training of the researcher, and the audience for the research* (Dobbin & Gatowski, 1999 p.42).

It is clear, therefore, that the process of choosing a research paradigm is not a simple one. It appears that the choice of research paradigm and methods must be informed by the selection of research purpose and questions (Minichiello et al., 1995, p.45), yet, paradoxically, the research questions are

invariably informed by the research method (Dobbin & Gatowski, 1999)

With this in mind, the succinct, yet essential differences between quantitative and qualitative research paradigms are captured in the following descriptions:
Quantitative studies highlight

> *The measurement and analysis of causal relationships between variables, not processes. Proponents of such studies claim that their work is done from a value-free framework of inquiry* (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005c p.10).

In qualitative research, as the word implies, there is an emphasis on the qualities of entities, on the processes and meanings and the value-laden nature of inquiry, which queries how social experience is created and given meaning (ibid). A more detailed account of these research paradigms now ensues.

Quantitative research is an inquiry into an identified problem where a theory is tested, measured with numbers, and analysed using statistical means. The aim of quantitative methods is to determine whether the predictive generalisations of a theory or hypothesis hold true. Pivotal aspects of quantitative research include the understanding that reality is objective, that the researcher must remain distant and independent of the subject of the research, that research is value-free and is based on deductive forms of reasoning with hypotheses being tested in a cause-effect order (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005c; Dobbin & Gatowski, 1999 p.42). The ultimate aim here is to formulate generalisations that allow the researcher to predict, explain and understand the phenomena being studied (Gorard, Rushforth, & Taylor, 2004)

In Dobbin & Gatowski's (1999) view there are three general types of quantitative methods:

(a) **Experiments** are delineated by random assignment of subjects to experimental conditions and involve the use of experimental controls.
(b) **Quasi-Experiments** share almost all the features of experimental designs except that they involve non-randomised assignment of subjects to experimental conditions.
(c) **Surveys** include cross-sectional and longitudinal studies using questionnaires where the gathering of a sample of data or opinions from a smaller population is deemed to be representative of a whole

population.

In contrast, a study based upon a **qualitative process of inquiry**, such as this one, has the goal of understanding a social or human problem from multiple perspectives. It is an interpretive methodology. Denzin & Lincoln (2005a) claim that qualitative research is conducted in a natural setting and involves a process of constructing a dynamic and holistic picture of the phenomenon of interest using and collecting of a variety of materials:

> *Case study; personal experience; introspection; life story; interview, artefacts; cultural texts and productions; observational, historical, interactional, and visual texts* (p.3).

Typically, the qualitative researcher will *"employ a wide range of interconnected interpretive methodologies in an effort to gain a rich understanding of the subject matter"* (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005a, p.4). Dobbin & Gatowski (1999), create three groupings of qualitative methods:

(a) **Case Studies** where the researcher explores a case (single entity or phenomenon) which is restricted by both time and activity (e.g. a programme, event, institution, or social group) and collects detailed information through a range data collection procedures over a specific period of time. The case study is a descriptive record of an individual's experiences and/or behaviours kept by the researcher. *"A case study is not a methodological choice but a choice of what is to be studied"* (Stake, 2000, p.435). In short, a case study is a form of inquiry that involves analysing a case or a group of cases from a sociological viewpoint (ibid).

(b) **Ethnographic Studies** where the researcher studies an integral cultural group in a natural setting over a specific period of time; a group who share a social experience, location, or other social phenomenon of concern. Ethnographers often live among the people they are studying, or at least spend a considerable amount of time with them and engage in *"participant observation"* (Spradley, 1980), which means that they participate in local daily life carefully and observe everything they can about it. Through this, ethnographers seek to gain what is called an "*emic*" perspective, or the *"native's point(s) of view"* without imposing their own conceptual frameworks

(Pike, 1954). The emic world view, which may be quite different from the "*etic*", or outsider's perspective on local life, is a unique and critical part of anthropology (Pike, 1954) According to O'Reilly (2005), through the participant observation method, ethnographers record detailed field notes, conduct interviews based on open-ended questions, and gather whatever documents might be available in the setting as data.

(c) **Phenomenological Studies** where human experiences are examined through the detailed description of the people being studied. The goal is to understand the 'lived experience' of this small group of individuals, over a sustained period of time (Polit, Beck, & Hungler, 2001).

In this study, a case study approach has been adopted because, according to Yin (1994), a case study is the proper research design when a phenomenon's variables cannot be separated from its context. This approach was also selected based on Merriam's (1998) definition of a case as:

> *A phenomenon that is inherently bounded, with a finite amount of time for data collection or a limited number of people who could be interviewed or observed* (p.27).

In essence, a case study is a form of inquiry that involves analysing a case or a group of cases from a sociological viewpoint (Stake, 2000).

Stake (2000) describes three types of case study: intrinsic, instrumental and collective.

Intrinsic case studies are undertaken because the researcher wants a better understanding of a particular case, therefore the purpose is not to build broad-ranging theory.

Instrumental cases are chosen where the case provides the researcher with an insight into a specific issue; the case is of secondary interest;

> *It is examined in-depth, its context is scrutinised and its ordinary activities are detailed to help the researcher to pursue an external interest* (ibid, p.437).

Collective case studies are essentially instrumental studies that extend to many cases.

> *With even less intrinsic interest in one particular case, a researcher may jointly study a number of cases in order to investigate a phenomenon, population, or general condition* (ibid, p.437).

There is a blurring of boundaries between the three categories and it is clear that this study features all three case study types: *intrinsic* because the researcher wants to gain a better understanding of PETE students' learning on TP, *instrumental* because it investigates five specific cases in an in-depth manner (see pp. 90-91) and *collective* as this study cross-compares the support for PETE student learning across the five case studies.

Case studies may also be categorised in accordance with the number of cases studied (Yin, 2004). In this way, a **single case study** involves the investigation of one case; where the case represents a critical test or existing theory, is a rare or unique event, or represents a revelatory purpose (Yin, 1994). A **Multiple case study** simply means that more than one case is studied. Stake and Yin share the view that:

> *Cases are chosen because it is believed that understanding them will lead to better understanding ... about a still larger collection of cases* (Stake, 2000, p.437).

In this research, the study analysed <u>one</u> umbrella case (university and PETE students and the schools) which comprised of five individual cases: tetrads of PETE student teacher, cooperating teacher (CT), University tutor (UT) and School Principal (SP). Therefore it is a multiple case study containing intrinsic, instrumental and collective cases. Through this vehicle, the phenomenon of PETE students' professional learning support from CTs, UTs and SPs during TP was studied over a seven month period. The study utilised a range of qualitative research methods – open profile questionnaires, recording of key events, focus groups, collection of artefacts, in-depth interviews and a reflective journal. Clearly, case studies can include *any* methodology, thus affording researchers the latitude to use a wide variety of evidence – documents, artefacts, interviews, and observations (Yin, 1994). In addition, a case study may focus on an individual, a group of individuals, a school, a programme or an innovation. In this study, within the umbrella case study, individual cases at the heart of the research focused on individual PETE students and those around them who supported their learning during TP.

Even though qualitative research was first undertaken more than a century

ago, the first texts that tried to define its methodology appeared in the late 1960s. This next section explores the reasons why there was such a long delay and why many sociologists, who worked using qualitative methods and techniques during this period, failed to see the need for methodological training. The reasons for this delay are multiple, complex and contradictory and may be due to theoretical, technical, and political considerations (Gobo, 2005, p.1). Perhaps, the best place to begin is by understanding the overall history of research.

History of Research and the Renaissance of Qualitative Methodologies

Quantitative and qualitative research paradigms emanated from the broader notion of 'research' because of the ways in which knowledge was conceptualised. Kuhn (1970) proposed the concept of specific paradigms, suggesting that there can be more than one set of basic beliefs, or 'paradigms' about what constitutes reality and counts as knowledge. According to Morgan (1983), paradigms provide philosophical, theoretical, instrumental, and methodological fundamentals for conducting research and, in addition, provide researchers with a platform from which to interpret the world. Snape & Spencer (2003) conducted an in-depth account of how quantitative and qualitative paradigms emerged, and the following two paragraphs provide a synopsis of events.

Snape and Spencer (2003) argue that the key principles on which research are founded stem from the works of Descartes, Newton and Bacon, Hume and Comte. In 1637, Réné Decartes wrote 'Discourse on Methodology' in which he advocated that researchers must be objective, needing to preserve a distance from anything that might impede their analytical powers. Building on this notion, in the 17th century, Newton and Bacon proposed that rather than deducing knowledge of the world through abstract propositions, it should be induced through direct observation. David Hume, who is credited as the founder of the notion of empirical research, held that all knowledge of the world stems from our experience and is derived through our senses. Comte, further extrapolated these theories of direct observation and unbiased objective data collection through his notion of positivism, where he held that

only phenomena which are observable can be counted as knowledge, thus allowing facts and values to remain separate and creating the space for objective inquiry to occur.

Coupled with these developments, in 1781, Immanuel Kant wrote the 'Critique of Pure Reason' in which he advocated for ways of knowing the world other than direct observation. Kantian theory advocated that scientific and practical forms of reason should be distinct forms of inquiry. In this way, Kant acknowledged that there were both traditional scientific (quantitative) and social (qualitative) forms of research. By the beginning of the twentieth century within Western civilisation, there were two principle camps viewing knowledge through either the Cartesian lens (quantitative) or the Kantian lens (qualitative). The Cartesian view upheld the *"certainty and self-evidence of mathematics as the model of reasoned theory and philosophy"* thus championing the quantitative research paradigm (Freebody, 2003, p.18). The Kantian theory held that perception relates not only to the senses but to human interpretations of what the senses tell us. In addition, our knowledge of the world is grounded in understanding that arises from thinking about what happens to us, not just simply from sensing specific experiences (Snape & Spencer, 2003). Thus, Kantian theory became the bedrock of the qualitative paradigm.

Building on these early developments, a number of key historical issues marked the progress of the qualitative research paradigm. Firstly, historically, qualitative research was often harnessed by the:

> *White-skinned, colonising nations who relied very much on sociology and anthroplogy to understand the 'Other' and to gain ultimate power over foreign exotic dark skinned cultures and it was deemed to be a 'dirty word'* (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005b, p.1).

Secondly, even though the qualitative research paradigm has been in existence for more than a century (Henry Mahew's (1985) qualitative study of the London poor in 1840s being one such study), the first text that promoted systematic qualitative research was not published until the late 1960s: 'The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research by Glaser and Strauss (1967)'. According to Gobo (2005), it seemed as though the methodology was largely developed by individual researchers in the 'Chicago School'. This was the name given to the prestigious University of Chicago's

Sociology Department in the 1920s and 1930s whose members engaged in qualitative methodologies referred to as 'ethnographic studies within the urban environment'. These scholars used ethnography as a means of understanding social life and, through this, created an *"interpretive methodology which maintained the centrality of the narrated life history approach"* (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005c, p.16).

Thirdly, as has been noted many qualitative researchers had no formal training in any particular data analysis methods up to the late 1950s. This might have been due to the fact that, as experts in polls and surveys, these researchers saw participant observation and in-depth interviews as ways to enhance questionnaire data. In this way, qualitative methodologies remained in a subordinate role, merely supporting quantitative data but not recognised as robust methodologies in their own right (Gobo, 2005, p.2). In tandem with this, there appeared to be a belief that while the quantitative methodology of gathering statistics needed exclusive training, qualitative methods of fieldwork could be learned 'just by doing it'. As Everett Hughes (Chicago School) put it, the only way to learn field methods was to *"get the seat of your pants dirty' in real research"*, to learn by trial and error; to learn through apprenticeship (Gobo, 2005, p.2).

Fourthly, by the 1960s, there was a clear divide established between qualitative and quantitative methodologies, each regarding the other as subordinate (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p.2). In the 1970s, qualitative inquiry, that was centred on critical and interpretive paradigms began to gain momentum. By the 1990s, many researchers began to:

> *Judge the days of value-free inquiry based on a God's–eye view of reality to be over [as researchers now agreed that] all inquiry was both moral and political [and that] writing itself was not innocent* (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005c, p.x).

This raised concerns about the validity and reliability of qualitative research, which will be explored later in this chapter (see p.81), and the notion that research findings needed to be translated into useful and relevant knowledge (Gorard et al., 2004). The United States responded to this, and currently awards the new *"gold standard"* to research that generates worthwhile knowledge, based on quantitative, experimental design studies (Lincoln & Cannella, 2004, p.7).

In summary, the qualitative paradigm has had a difficult journey marred by associations with colonisation, lack of formal methodology texts or training, and a continuing paradigm war centring on issues of validity and reliability. In spite of this, research is in the throes of a *"qualitative revolution which is taking over social sciences and related professional fields"* (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005c, p.ix). It is to explanations for this growth that the discussion now turns.

Philosophy of Qualitative Research

The qualitative paradigm has evolved into a complex entity comprising:

> *An overall research perspective which recognises the importance of the participants' frames of reference, the flexible nature of research design, the volume and richness of qualitative data, the distinctive approaches to analysis and interpretation* (Snape & Spencer, 2003, p.3).

According to Guba and Lincoln (2005, p.192) the qualitative paradigm is comprised of five perspectives: (a) Positivism (b) Post-positivism (c) Critical Theory (d) Constructivism and (e) Participatory. In this research, a Participatory perspective has been adopted. Using Guba & Lincoln's, (2005) description of the four elements of the Participatory view (Ethics, Epistemology, Ontology and Methodology), this choice is now justified in relation to this study.

Ethics from the Participatory perspective is deemed to be intrinsic and the process leans towards revelation. This infers that ethical considerations are an inherent part of the research given that the researcher is highly involved in the process. In this study, the researcher was an inherent part of the study and this led to particular ethical considerations. The details of these ethical issues are discussed on p.83 in this chapter.

Epistemology is viewed from a criticially subjective position, because living knowledge and practical knowledge are highly valued and findings are co-created by researcher and participants. Therefore knowledge is produced through the interaction of researcher and participants. This research has shown how the interplay between researcher, CTs, UTs, SPs and PETE students, created deep knowledge of PETE student learning on TP.

Ontology is seen as participative reality; subjective-objective reality and is co-created. The philosophy of this paradigm believes that knowledge is created through social interaction and from a situative perspective. This

study was conducted within the 'authentic conditions' (Fenwick, 1999) of TP.

Methodology is thought to be political participation in collaborative action, language is grounded in shared experiential context, and the practical is viewed as the ultimate conduit (Guba & Lincoln, 2005, pp.195-196). In this paradigm, language is the conduit for meaning making and identity formation (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Certainly, in this study, the range of methodologies employed relied on researcher and participants using a common language to co-create knowledge in 'authentic conditions' (Fenwick, 1999)

Taking these three factors into account, the researcher clearly embraced the Interpretive Tradition from a Participatory Perspective because, in this study, the social realities of TP for the participants were interpreted from a situative perspective, i.e. within the authentic context of TP. In this way the researcher could interrogate how PETE student learning was supported during TP.

What of the role of the qualitative researcher working from the Participatory Perspective? The qualitative researcher has been described in a myriad of ways: scientist, naturalist, field worker, journalist, social critic, artist, performer, jazz musician, film-maker, quilt maker, essayist, as bricoleur, a maker of quilts or an film maker who creates montages (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005a, p.4). Selecting just one of these multiple images, in this study the researcher could be described as a quilter who:

> *Stitches, edits and puts slices of reality together which creates and brings about psychological and emotional unity; a pattern to an interpretive experience* (ibid, p.5).

The realities are both captured and stitched together using the interpretive methodologies employed. It is not just what the qualitative researcher does that is important, rather it can be argued that the:

> *Way in which the social reality of people are being studied, understood and interpreted becomes one of the cultural motifs of qualitative research* (Bryman, 1988, p.8).

As such, the central tenet underpinning this view of research is of researcher engagement with the social reality of the issue under scrutiny. Therefore qualitative research becomes an activity of engagement:

> *A situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. The world is converted into*

> *a series of representations which make sense of, or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings that people bring to them* (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005a, p.5).

As stated previously, qualitative research encompasses a range of representations including:

> *Field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings and memos to the self...life story; interview; artefacts; cultural texts and productions; observational, historical, interactional and visual texts – that describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individuals' lives* (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005a, p.3/4).

Having such a wide range of data allows the researcher to view the topic at hand through a variety of lenses and has the potential to offer a rich and deep knowledge of the topic to be created (Brookfield, 1998).

In summary, the type of qualitative research employed depends on the research questions and the researcher's beliefs about the social world and how it can be understood (ontology), the nature of knowledge and how it might be acquired (epistemology), the purposes and goals of research, the characteristics of the research participants, the audience for research, the funders of the research, the lived experience, position and environment of the researchers themselves (ethics) and the methodology (Snape & Spencer, 2003). Importantly, in undertaking qualitative research, the researcher becomes part of the fabric of the research process. This notion leads to questions about subjectivity within the qualitative paradigm.

Qualitative Research and Subjectivity

The issue of subjectivity appears to be relatively clear-cut within the quantitative research paradigm. At the heart of the quantitative methodology is scientific objectivity which insists researchers maintain a distance and derive knowledge through empirical study where *"the knower can be completely differentiated from the known"* (Allen, Benner, & Diekelmann, 1986, p.1) This leads to a reductionist approach where inferences can be drawn about the whole from analysis of its parts. In essence, reality is conceptualised as two-dimensional and determined by cause-and-effect relationships. This 'way of knowing' is deductive and emphasises observing truth as a singular objective reality. In contrast, subjectivity is an inherent part

of qualitative methodologies. In fact, subjectivity guides everything from the choice of topic that one studies, to formulating hypotheses, to selecting methodologies, and interpreting data. The qualitative paradigm aims to understand the social world from respondent explanations through detailed descriptions of their actions, and through the richness of meaning associated with observable behaviour (Wildemuth, 1993). Thus, in the qualitative paradigm, which rejects the value of cause-and-effect constructs devoid of any socio-historical context, the separation between researcher and respondent is reduced (Munhall, 1989).

Kemmis (1980) asserts that the true value of non-experimental research lies in its connection to the real world, its ability to describe actions in their social and historical contexts, and its ability to rationally critique these descriptions. It is important to note that as qualitative researchers rely upon their humanity throughout the research process, it is neither possible nor desirable to escape the subjective as researcher. Indeed, it is this inherent humanity which informs the researcher and facilitates intuitive moments while navigating the research process. Clearly, in qualitative methodology, the researcher is encouraged to reflect on the values and objectives brought to the research and how these affect the research project (Ratner, 2002). For example, Merriam et al (2003a) describes the ways in which the researcher plays an essential role in qualitative research serving as the principal instrument for data collection and analysis, oscillating as he/she moves in, through and out of the field (Kirk & Miller, 1986). In so doing, the researcher has the opportunity to gather *"intricate details about phenomena such as feelings, thought processes and emotions"* (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p.11). Furthermore, Toma (2000) explains that valuable qualitative data can be generated through collaboration between the researcher and the subject where the researcher, as insider *"cares deeply about what and whom they are studying"* (p.177). Questions remain, however, about whether data generated in this way are limited to the particular or can have a wider significance and application. In traditional research terms, this raises questions about the concept of generalisability.

Qualitative Research and Generalisability

In research literature, the word generalisability is defined as the degree to which the findings can be generalised from the study sample to the entire population (Polit & Hungler, 1991). Generalisability appears to be a key *"hallmark of convincing and cumulating social science"* coupled with transparency and replicability (Gorard, 2000, p.13). Gorard cites:

> *The very distinction between the two supposed paradigms of research is perhaps overused and seemingly an excuse for some to evade the limitations of generalisation, transparency, replicability* (ibid, p.13).

In other words, Gorard is suggesting that qualitative researchers are simply avoiding questions about research rigour. Favouring the rigours of quantitative research, Gorard makes a plea *"for a middle way in education research: balanced, rational and numerate"* (ibid, p.13). The arguments put forward by Gorard are strong and are echoed in current American education research. The What Works Clearing House (WWC) (2008a), a body formed by the US Department of Education's Institute of Education Sciences appears to be in agreement as it aims:

> *To provide educators, policy makers, researchers and the public with a central trusted source of scientific evidence of what works in education* (p.1).

The following extract outlining the WWC 'gold standards' acceptable research design provides evidence of this:

> *Study designs that provide the strongest evidence of effects include: randomised controlled trials, regression discontinuity designs, quasi-experimental designs (must use a similar comparison group and have no attrition or disruption problems), and single subject designs* (What Works Clearing House, 2008b, p.1).

It is clear from this that quantitative studies are favoured and qualitative studies dismissed *"because they are not outcome evaluations"* and as such would not meet the WWC 'gold standard' (What Works Clearing House, 2008b). Some evaluation theorists would agree with Gorard and the WWC having a *"simple credo: only randomised experiments produce the truth"* (House, 2005, p.637). This view appears to be rooted in the belief that *"education is a field of fads in which there has been no progress...in contrast there has been great progress in medicine...resulting from randomised field trial"* (ibid). However, it is also possible to argue that social research is different because:

> *When educational programmes are placed in different settings there are dozens - if not hundreds - of influences that are impossible to control even in randomised*

> *experiments. This means that the results vary even when the treatment appears to be the same* (House, 2005, p.1080).

The methodological debate pivots around the different values placed on the instrinic study of the particular, as compared to studies which offer findings that can be generalised to a wider population. Stake (2005) posits that generalisability does not have to be emphasised in all research. Indeed, Stake believes that:

> *Damage is caused when the commitment to generalise or to theorise runs so strong that the researcher's attention is drawn away from the features important for understanding the case itself* (p.448).

More recently, in an analysis of the quality of education research in the UK, Gorard (2004) acknowledged that in fact there were problems with generalisabilty in both quantitative and qualitative paradigms. He described the majority of UK education research as small scale and non-cumulative, arguing that stakeholders believe that it tended to over-generalise from small samples (ibid, p.379). There is some agreement that what is needed is high quality, rigorous, well-designed studies that are appropriate to the research method chosen. Plainly, there is a pressing need to improve:

> *All forms of research to have a greater understanding of a wide range of approaches, clear research questions, greater fit between questions and methods...a greater transparency in our warrants as researchers* (ibid, p.393).

Gorard (2004) surmises *"It's the unwarranted claims based on weak research that do the harm"* and concludes by saying that

> *It may be the process of transforming research findings into useful and relevant knowledge that requires the most attention* (ibid, pp.393/394).

Lincoln and Guba's (1985) use of the word 'trustworthiness' has been suggested as one way in which qualitiative, and indeed quantitative research can produce *"useful and relevant knowledge"* (Gorard et al., 2004). Lincoln and Guba (1985) define trustworthiness as a way of knowing whether an inquiry's findings are *"worth paying attention to"* (p.290), a point already raised by Gorard (2004). According to Lincoln & Guba, (1985) in any qualitative research project, four aspects of trustworthiness are important:

- Credibility is an evaluation of whether or not the research findings represent a 'credible' conceptual interpretation of the original data drawn from the participants;

- Transferability is the degree to which the findings of this inquiry can apply or transfer beyond the bounds of the study;
- Dependability is an assessment of the quality of the integrated processes of data collection, data analysis, and theory generation, and
- Confirmability is a measure of how well the inquiry's findings are supported by the data collected (p.296).

It has been argued that these four concepts can replace the positivist criteria of internal/external validity and objectivity (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005a) and they have been employed in this study. For example, the researcher in this study endeavoured to maintain trustworthiness by using robust data collection and analysis frameworks to maintain credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This was done by conducting the research over a period of seven months during which time data were gathered from the case study participants during three key cycles using overlapping data collection methods (open profile questionnaires, in-depth questionnaires and focus group interviews, collection of artefacts and the researcher's reflective journal). The data generated and analysed in each phase, using systematic grounded theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) acted as fodder informing the next phase of data collection and analysis. It is believed that in this way, the researcher quarried into the data and therefore produced a rich and thick description of the event(s) revealing interpretations of interpretations (Geertz, 2000) and gaining deep insights into the complex ways in which PETE students were supported to learn during TP.

It is acknowledged in this study that small qualitative studies are not generalisable in the traditional sense, however, it is also argued that studies such as this have redeeming qualities (Myers, 2000). In this study of Irish PETE students, the generalisability of the research does not derive from the representativeness of the sample, but from the way in which the concepts and experiences are likely to be applicable to and shared by other relevant settings and groups. A major strength of the qualitative approach employed in this study is the depth to which explorations are conducted and descriptions are written, usually resulting in a plethora of details allowing a deep understanding of the nuances of the situation under scrutiny.

In addition to concerns about generalisability, qualitative methodology is criticised because studies are, by their nature difficult to replicate. This is because qualitative researchers do not provide enough detail about their procedures (data collection and analysis) to allow others to know about the quality of the research (Gorard et al., 2004). To counteract this, in this study, the researcher is providing extensive information on methods and data analysis procedures to ensure that the processes are transparent for the reader. In addition, questions about both the validity and the reliability of this study have been addressed.

Qualitative Research: Reliability and Validity

International literature on the issue of reliability and validity reveals a bewildering range of views. Lissitz & Samuelsen (2007) assert that reliability is an aspect of validity. Sireci (2007) disagrees and borrows Campbell and Fiske's (1959) characterisation of reliability and validity:

> *As ends of a continuum (i.e., reliability as mono-method-mono-trait validity) rather than the view that reliability is an internal aspect of validity* (p.480).

Minichiello, Aroni, Timewell & Alexander (1995) claim that validity and reliability are constituents of objectivity, a view which is contested by Guba & Greenwood (2005). In this study, the view is taken that reliability and validity are the primary criteria of evaluation of an observation (Black, 1993). In other words, care is taken in this study to ensure that the findings reported are presented as valid, only if the data are reliable and consistent across the five case studies.

Reliability

By definition, reliability is the extent to which a measurement procedure gives the same answer on different occasions. Reliability is the consistency of measurement, or the degree to which an instrument measures the same way, each time it is used, under the same condition, with the same subjects; in short, it is the repeatability of the measurement. Thus, a measure is considered reliable if a person's score on the same test, given twice, is similar. It is also important to remember that reliability is not measured, it is estimated. There are two ways that reliability is usually estimated: test/retest and internal consistency. So, for example, reliability in in-depth interviewing

involves checking the potency of the data (Minichiello et al., 1995) by asking whether the researcher could replicate the same finding if he/she conducted the research again in the same manner. The difficulty, of course, is that in social science, the participants are quite likely to change their views over time (ibid) or even as a result of engaging in the research process. These problems also arise in quantitative research but are accounted for by the use of large sample sizes. In this study, however, the researcher has conducted in-depth research with a relatively low number of participants and has reported the data faithfully and transparently.

Kirk & Miller (1986) argue that reliability in research is attained in two ways;

(a) The study is reported in a detailed and accessible manner so that it may be replicated and

(b) The results of the study are reported in a transparent way in terms of theoretically meaningful variables.

The researcher has addressed each of these demands in reporting this study. Each is now addressed in turn.

The study is reported in a detailed and accessible manner so that it may be replicated.

The key mechanism to ensuring reliability in this research has been to document the research procedure fastidiously (Minichiello et al., 1995). It has been important, in this study, therefore, to detail how and why the researcher made certain decisions during the research, the alleged impact of such decisions on the researcher and informants and how the data were collected and analysed (Kirk & Miller, 1986). This information is located in this chapter (pp. 88 - 113) and reported such that this study could, in theory at least, be replicated.

The results of the study are reported in a transparent way in terms of theoretically meaningful variables.

Minichiello (1980) believes the most effective means of adding to understanding is by preparing research reports that speak to the reader through words or pictures that capture the humanity of the researcher engaged in the research process; something which, he claims, more

traditional 'scientific' studies cannot capture. Yin (1994) is also concerned with rigour in non-experimental research, and while he concludes that studies do not require a minimum number of cases, or randomly selected cases, Yin cautions researchers to work with the situation that presents itself in each case in order to structure the best possible study that can be adequately described in the research report. Taking this into account, in order to fully capture the dynamics of each tetrad (PETE student, CT, UT and SP), the study utilised a range of data collection methods to capture the reality of each PETE student's experience of TP, and data were collected from each of the study's participants in the same fastidious manner. In addition, data were interrogated using the process of grounded theory. In this way, the findings are analysed and discussed in Chapters Twelve, Thirteen and Fourteen, merging pertinent literature with findings and thus employing theoretically robust variables.

Validity

Lissitz & Samuelsen (2007) argue that the researcher must consider two aspects of a study when evaluating its validity: the *internal* aspect relates to the development and evaluation of the study's test instruments; the external aspect relates to the instrument's suitability for purpose and impact. Validity refers to the potency of research conclusions, inferences or propositions. More formally, it is defined as the:

> *Best available approximation to the truth or falsity of a given inference, proposition or conclusion* (Cook & Campbell, 1979, p.1).

Clearly, it is imperative that any researcher is able to support truth claims. From a situative perspective, 'truth' is established because:

> *Our personal world is constructed in our minds and...these personal constructions define our personal realities* (Savery & Duffy, 1995, p.9).

Linked to this, social constructivists claim:

> *Knowledge evolves through social negotiation and through the evaluation of the viability of individual understandings* (ibid, p. 31).

Therefore *"truth is partial, dependent on position and context"* (Maher & Tetreault, 1992, p.38), the former referring to gender, race, and class (Lueddeke, 1999). This implies, from a social constructivist point of view, a relativist view of truth. Certainly it could be argued that in an interview, which is essentially a social construction, researcher and participants each have

their own perception of the truth of the situation and this changes or shifts constantly depending on the context and position of each person. In this regard, Minichiello et al (1995) posit that there are three types of truth error which may make research invalid:

(a) Believing a principle to be true when it is not;

(b) Rejecting a principle when it is in fact true;

(c) Asking the wrong question i.e. one that is misunderstood by the informant or regarded by the informant as evidence of misunderstanding on the part of the researcher.

Kirk and Miller (1986) argue that the latter is the source of most validity errors in qualitative research. In in-depth interviews, therefore, it can be argued that the researcher should attempt to remain close to the practical experience of the study in order to ensure a close fit between the data and informants' perceptions, views, attitudes and behaviours (Minichiello et al., 1995) According to Taylor & Bogdan (1984), this is attempted and achieved by being faithful to the language or behaviours of the informants and ensuring that the researcher uses member-checking to ensure correctness of data (Rossman & Rallis, 1998). In addition, using a variety of data collection methods and approaches, the process of triangulation (Begley, 1996) allows the researcher *"to determine how various actors in the situation view it"* (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p.44), i.e. viewing the phenomenon through a range of lenses (Brookfield, 1998). More recently, the image of crystallisation has been used to capture this notion and it is helpful in understanding the processes adopted in this study. Crystallisation may be viewed as a form of triangulation:

> *Each viewpoint is akin to the light hitting the crystal, and reflects a different version of the subject matter. Triangulation is a simultaneous display of multiple refracted realities* (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005a, p.6).

The image of the crystal is used in place of the triangle to capture the dynamics of the varying viewpoints of the phenomena under investigation:

> *The central imagery is the crystal which combines symmetry and substance with an infinite variety of shapes, substances and transmutations, multi-dimensionalities and angles of approach. Crystals grow change and are altered but they are not amorphous. Crystals are prisms that reflect externalities and refract within themselves creating different colors patterns arrays and casting off in different directions* (Richardson, 2000, p.934)

According to Richardson & St. Pierre (2005), crystallisation challenges the traditional idea of 'validity', because:

> *Crystallisation provides us with a deepened complex partial understanding of the topic. Paradoxically, we know more and doubt what we know. Ingeniously we know there is always more to know* (p.963).

In this study, the research questions were answered using a variety of data collection methods; the aim being to enable crystallisation of the findings through a wide range of qualitative data analysis methods. To conclude, Greenwood & Levin (2005) assert that if a study is valid, it generates warrants for action (p.54). The key question to ask is:

> *Would the researcher feel sufficiently secure to construct social policy or legislation based on the findings?* (Guba & Lincoln, 2005, p.205).

Therefore, if it can be argued and demonstrated that this study's findings are valid, then, it should be feasible to suggest they become a catalyst for action to improve the support of PETE student learning on TP. This being the case, it is imperative that the study is conducted in an ethical manner.

Qualitative Research: Ethics and Research

Hulley & Cummings (2006) assert that every study involving human informants raises its own unique set of ethical issues. Ethics are defined as the quality of research procedures with respect to their adherence to professional, legal and social obligations to the research subjects (Polit & Hungler, 1991). Researchers must acknowledge the socially constructed ethics within qualitative research, by considering the relational issues that are instrinsic aspects of human research (Roth, 2004). Guillemin & Gillam (2004) describe two dimensions of ethics in research: (a) procedural ethics which involves gaining approval from participants and (b) ethics in practice which pertains to the everyday ethical issues which may arise during the course of the research and refer to *"ethically important moments in research"* – the unpredictable moments that arise during research (p.263). The concept of ethics will be addressed using these two dimensions.

A number of mechanisms were used to satisfy procedural ethics. Firstly, ethical approval for the study was sought from Loughborough University in the United Kingdom (UK). This involved providing a detailed report outlining all research instruments and consent forms to be used. This report was ratified

by the Research Ethics Committee at the University in July 2006. Secondly, with regard to selection of participants, there were two key issues to consider:

(a) In qualitative studies the participants are selected purposefully because they will be particularly informative about the topic (Cresswell, 2002). In this study all seventeen PETE students in the Grad Dip Programme were offered the opportunity to take part in this study and five of these volunteered (see p.91).

(b) To obtain ethical and informed consent from the participants the researcher must describe the research purpose and procedures, report foreseeable risks and expected benefits, offer to answer questions regarding the procedures, and explain clearly that participation is voluntary and that participants have the right to discontinue at any time (Anderson & Arsenault, 2000). This protocol was followed with all participants in this study [See Appendix B, p.291]

It is essential that both researcher and respondent understand that free and informed consent by the respondent is not a one-time event but an ongoing process. As such, the participant must be made fully aware of his or her power to withdraw from the research at any time in the process. Although the researcher's authority or influence can complicate the consent process, individuals can also feel obliged to consent because of pressure from peers or expectations from where the research is taking place (Anderson & Arsenault, 2000).

The *"ethics in practice"* (Guillemin & Gillam, 2004, p.261) element of this study had a number of implications. For example, the researcher discovered that the ethical process was indeed anything other than a fait accompli, but rather was a continuing process of negotiation with the participants which became increasingly complex. To illustrate this point, four particular instances are outlined:

(a) Four out of five of the PETE students began to view the researcher as a facilitator in the TP process; a person to whom they could express their grievances and worries. This allowed the researcher to excavate deep into the data generated by these PETE students and understand their TP experience in a more situated manner. However,

it was very important that the researcher maintained confidentiality on more sensitive issues and only reported data that PETE students were happy to disclose.

(b) All the participants asked the researcher for advice on PCK during TP. This, further reinforced data suggested that PETE students were unsupported in their learning on TP and that they foraged for PCK from any source available. At times the researcher had to take up the role of mentor instead of researcher. This dual role was difficult to maintain at times. It did show, however, that the researcher had built up trust with the PETE students and thus all interviews were open and transparent. It also indicated that the PETE students respected the researcher and regarded her as an expert in PE PCK in light of her work as a PE teacher and UT, although not this course.

(c) School Principals (SPs) used the interview as an opportunity to make political points by highlighting complaints about the exclusion of schools from meaningful involvement in the teaching practice process. The researcher had to ensure to check with the SPs that all of the data collected could be reported in this study. One SP asked that the dictaphone was switched off during part of the interview and spoke 'off the record'. The researcher did not report this data.

(d) When presenting the interim findings to the participant tutors and other interested parties, one of the participants described how shocked she was at the results reported feeling that it implicated her, as TP Co-ordinator, in many of the difficulties highlighted. This tutor was disappointed that her work as co-ordinator appeared to have contributed to, rather than alleviated these problems. This resulted in the researcher realising that some participants may take a wholly subjective view of the results, feeling that their actions are being singled out in the study. Therefore, it is very important to be accurate, yet, sensitive in reporting findings.

It is while negotiating such *"ethics in practice that the researcher's ethical competence comes to the fore"* (Guillemin & Gillam, 2004, p.269). This implies that the researcher needs to recognise dynamic ethical situations and

be willing to engage with ethical issues continuously and respond in a reflective manner.

As was pointed out at the start of this section, every study of humans will involve inherent ethical issues (Hulley & Cummings, 2006). However, it is the way in which the researcher (a) negotiates the procedural ethics and the ethics of practice during the study and (b) shares the management of these ethical issues in a transparent manner with the reader, that allows the study to be as ethically sound as possible. The ways in which this was achieved can be seen in the detailed account of the study's Research Design.

The Research Design

This section comprises the following key sections:

1. The Research Process.
2. Case Study Approach and Case Studies.
3. Qualitative Data Collection Methods.
4. Chronological Account of Data Collection.
5. Qualitative Data Analysis Methods: Grounded theory.
6. Researcher Personal Critical Statement.

Research Process

There were two aspects to the research process:

(a) Permission had to be sought and granted from Greendale University Grad Dip Course Board to allow this research to take place.

(b) The data collection methodologies chosen were guided by the research questions (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005a).

<u>(a) Requesting permission to undertake the research at Greendale University</u>

It was requested that the researcher gave a presentation of the Research Proposal to the Greendale University Course Board of the Grad Dip in Education (Physical Education), comprising tutors from the Physical Education and Sports Studies (PESS) department and Educational and Professional Studies (EPS) department. The Grad Dip programme was being run jointly by both departments, therefore UTs from both departments supervised PETE students on TP. This presentation was designed to inform the UT of the nature of the proposed research [See Appendix A, p.283] and to

request permission to undertake the research. Permission was granted on 22nd June 2006.

(b) Research Action Checklist

Thereafter, the data collection process began and was guided by the main research questions and sub-questions outlined in Chapter One (pp.3-4). The Research Action Checklist details the data collection methods chosen to answer each of these questions.

	Main Research Questions	Answered Using
1	How are PETE students supported to learn effectively during TP within the existing partnership model?	Open profile questionnaires, in-depth interview questionnaires, focus groups, artefacts, key events
2	How do teacher-mentors and university tutors view their roles and the nature of learning within current model of TP supervision?	Open profile questionnaires, in-depth interview questionnaires, focus groups, artefacts, key events
3	What is the nature of the PETE student learning that takes place on TP?	Open profile questionnaires, in-depth interview questionnaires, focus groups, artefacts, key events
4	How does school-based learning link to other strands of the teacher education programme in supporting student teacher competence?	Open profile questionnaires, in-depth interview questionnaires, focus groups, artefacts, key events

	Sub-questions asked	Answered using
1	What does international research literature say about teacher learning and student	Literature review: Chapter Two - Learning,

	teacher learning?	Teacher learning and PETE student learning Chapter Five – Teacher Learning in Physical Education
2	From international research literature, what is known about different models of learning and on what theories of learning are they based?	Literature review: Chapter Two - Learning, Teacher learning and PETE student learning
3	How is mentoring framed within these theories of learning?	Literature Review: Chapter Three - Mentoring
4	Which learning theories underpin ITE supervision models, internationally?	Literature review: Chapter Four - Teacher Education: Policy and Practice
5	What are the theoretical underpinnings of the current model of TP supervision within the Grad Dip at Greendale University?	Open profile questionnaires, in-depth interview questionnaires, focus groups, artefacts, key events Literature review on PETE ITE

Table 2: How Data Collection was Used to Answer Research Questions

This study has been framed within a case study approach. Details of this approach and of the five case studies in this study are found in the next section.

Case Study

This study analysed <u>one</u> umbrella case (university and PETE students and the schools) which comprised five individual cases: five tetrads of PETE student, CT, UT and SP. Through this vehicle, the phenomenon of how PETE students experienced learning support from CTs, UTs and SPs during TP was studied over a seven-month period. As outlined earlier in this chapter (pp. 68-70), clearly, case studies can include *any* methodology, thus affording researchers the latitude to use a wide variety of evidence – documents,

artefacts, interviews, and observations (Yin, 1994). The following table outlines the five case studies and their participants. It also shows details of type of school in each case.

The Cases

There are *five* individual case studies. The case studies were selected, initially, by offering all seventeen Grad Dip students an opportunity to participate in the research. Of this group, there were fifteen females and two males. As a result of this process, five female PETE students volunteered to take part in this study. The UT, CT and SP assigned to each PETE student on TP then became part of each case study, giving rise to five individual case studies. Therefore, each case study comprised four individuals: PETE student, CT, UT and SP. Pseudonyms have been used throughout to protect the identity of the participants. It is important to recognise, therefore, that the PETE students at the core of each case study were self-selected research participants.

	PETE student	CT	University Tutors	School Principal	School type	School	Town
1	Aoife	Louise	Noelle	Ms. Kelly	Girls town	TowerHill	Killnaton
2	Barbara	John	Claire	Mr. Cotter	Girls town	Byron's Way	Ballytown
3	Carol	Michael	Claire	Mr. O'Brien	Mixed rural	TreeTops	Oceantown
4	Dara	Anita	Liz	Mr. Clancy	Mixed town	Mountview	Riverdale
5	Edel	Joan	Claire	Mr. Noonan	Mixed rural	Bayview	Valleytown

Table 3: Case Study Details

Note:

1. Mr. O'Brien was a Deputy Principal (DP) because the School Principal was unavailable for interview.
2. The researcher also gathered data from other participants in the TP process to add a richness to the study:
    a. **Education Tutors**: Sinead, Nigel and Lillian.
    b. **Additional CTs**: Imelda, Laura, Martha and Trevor.

The over-riding thrust of case study research, however, is the study of a small number of cases in considerable *depth* (Hammersley & Gomm, 2000) in

contrast to, for example, social survey which investigates many cases (individuals) and gathers a comparatively small amount of data on each. In this study, an in-depth, detailed analysis of five cases was conducted. In so doing, the researcher built an insightful picture of each case to ascertain how each of five PETE student teachers was supported to learn within TP. Thereafter, the data analysis process allowed thematic connections to be made between these five case studies. Although many other researchers have entered the *"generalisation fray"* (Armour, Yelling, & Duncombe, 2002), the intention was in the first instance to absorb the instrinsic value of each case (Donmoyer, 2000), and should connections emerge from all five cases, expand and generalise theories through the grounded theory process (see pp.102-111). This facilitated naturalistic generalisation (Stake, 1980, 2000) as themes were generated proactively from the data.

It has been acknowledged in this study that small qualitative studies are not generalisable in the traditional sense, however, it is also argued that studies such as this have redeeming qualities (Myers, 2000). In this study of Irish PETE students, the generalisability of the research did not derive from the representativeness of the sample, but from the way in which the concepts and experiences were likely to be applicable to, and shared by, relevant other settings and groups. A major strength of the qualitative approach employed in this study is the depth to which explorations were conducted and descriptions were written, usually resulting in a plethora of details which allowed a deep understanding of the nuances of the situation under scrutiny.

Qualitative Data Collection Methods

Qualitative data collection methods is an overarching term for research methodologies that describe people's experiences, behaviours, interactions and social contexts without the use of quantification (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). As mooted earlier in this chapter, a study based upon a qualitative process of inquiry, such as this one, has the goal of understanding a social or human problem from multiple perspectives. In order to elicit the meaning of the participants' experiences of the educational setting, an interpretive methodology was employed to gain a rich understanding of the subject matter

(Denzin & Lincoln, 2005a, p.4) The following qualitative research frameworks can be used in this context:

(a) **Endogenous** meaning 'arising from within' which ensures a true 'insider perspective'.

(b) **Action research** generates knowledge in relation to a strategic action susceptible of improvement (Carr & Kemmis, 1986).

(c) **Ethnography** which *"begins with personal memory and ending with curriculum"* (Rousmaniere, 2000, p.87). Essentially the art of gathering information through storytelling. This framework supports the notion that we are *"storytelling organisms who individually and collectively lead storied lives"* (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, p.16).

(d) **Heuristic** reveals personal experiences.

(e) **Life history** reports biographical experience.

(f) **Grounded Theory** evolves theory. It is the inductive process of discovering theory from data (Pigeon and Henwood, 2004).

The researcher tried to stay close to the practical experience of the study in order to ensure a close fit between the data and informants' perceptions, views, attitudes and behaviours (Minichiello et al., 1995). In addition, a variety of data collection methods and approaches, the process of triangulation (Begley, 1996) allows the researcher *"to determine how various actors in the situation view it"* (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p.44). More recently, as was noted earlier, the image of crystallisation (Richardson, 2000) has been used to capture this notion.

The specific approaches used in this study, to allow such crystallisation (Richardson, 2000) within the case study framework, included:

(A) Open Profile Questionnaires to elicit life events from participants within each case study. This is a very personal research instrument (Armour & Yelling, 2004). Two open profile questionnaires were used in this study. One was distributed to the five PETE students during the 'Observation Week' Cycle of TP. The second was issued to all participating CTs during the same phase. It was felt that open profile questionnaires would give the PETE students and the CTs the opportunity to reflect on their careers to date and thus provide the researcher with a very detailed, potentially rich, individual profile of these participants (ibid). Before each questionnaire was issued, a

comprehensive analysis was undertaken to ensure that the questions used were led by the research questions [see Appendix C, p.301]

(B) Recording key events through participant observation

Witz (2007) claimed *"the other is a unique individual, with his/her own personality, abilities, personal history, and inspiration"* (p.238). Participant observation is a mechanism by which to access this understanding of the other. A fundamental characteristic of the *"intensive participant observation"* and the *"participant as ally-essentialist portraiture" approach* (ibid, p.244) is that the investigator "absorbs" some of the "realities" of what is going on for the person or in the social context. However, "absorbing realities" also requires faithful reporting of objective situations and contexts based on field notes, audiotapes and transcripts of audiotapes, and merging this with the participants' thoughts and feelings to get a better understanding of the participants in their situated reality. In so doing, the researcher attempted to absorb the *"participant's unique individuality"* (ibid, p.245). Participant observation was used to understand each of the participants in the study at the following times: recording of key occurrences during Induction week August 21st- 25th 2006; a UT training meeting on September 13th 2006; and a PETE student, CT and UT in a post lesson conference on December 4th 2006.

(C) Focus Groups

Marshall & Rossman (1999) trace this method of interviewing participants in focus groups to marketing research. There are a number of references to focus groups in the literature. Morgan (1997) argues that focus groups are unique in that they can produce a range of data and insights that are more accessible because of interaction in a group setting. The main advantage with using focus groups lies in the fact that they are *"socially oriented"* (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p.115). This means that participants may feel relaxed in this conversational and supportive environment. The researcher, when using the focus group approach, can generate rich data through active listening (Oliver & Lalik, 2000) where the interviewer clarifies ambiguous responses using a very specific method of interviewing called *"hierarchial focusing"* (Tomlinson, 1989). This type of interview seeks in-depth accounts to ensure coverage of the researcher's agenda (asking leading questions perhaps generated from previous interviews) while trying to influence interviewees as little as possible. One focus group comprised all five PETE students in Cycle Three of TP. This

focus group involved a lively exchange from all participants. This may have been due to the fact that TP was now over and PETE students felt more relaxed, or that the researcher and the PETE students had built up a strong rapport having worked together for seven months. The second focus group comprised three UTs during Cycle Three. Participants were, again, quite vocal during this exchange and the researcher had to be skilled in the interview technique to ensure that all three voices were heard and that all questions were addressed. It became clear to the researcher that it was imperative to prepare cogent questions for focus group interviews in advance so that there was a clear script to follow and participants could be kept on task.

There are a number of criticisms or limitations of the focus group approach. For example, Brown & Gilligan (1992) argue that some participants in the group may be more vocal than others. Therefore it is important for the researcher to listen to 'what was not said', to evaluate the silences and to encourage an atmosphere of trust where participants feel they can speak with confidence (Oliver & Lalik, 2000). As Constantine (1999) said about translating poetry, one must consider *"the total workings of a text, not just the words"* (p.15). Therefore in this study, the researcher wrote copious notes on observations of the participants as soon as possible after each interview. Another limitation is that it can be difficult to find an appropriate setting for the focus group interviews. The researcher was fortunate in this study that both focus group interviews were conducted in Greendale University in a suitable room. Finally, there could be temporal (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) limitations to the study as the researcher had to liaise with study participants to organise the timing of data collection. This was an arduous process given geographical and school-timetabling constraints. Strauss & Corbin (1998) refer to these considerations when they say:

> *There are always constraints of time, energy, availability of participants, and other conditions that affect data collection...sometimes the researcher has no choice and must settle for a theoretical scheme that is less developed than desired* (pp. 292-293).

These constraints arose in this study when, due to geographical considerations and the availability of some participants, it was not possible to conduct a focus group interview with the CTs or SPs. This was disappointing, as the researcher felt that such focus groups would have added richness to

the data. As it turned out the CTs and SPs, when interviewed individually, seemed very open and the data extracted were still very powerful. In spite of these shortcomings, focus groups offered a natural social setting that had the potential to facilitate discussion. The researcher found that this was certainly the case in this study. Participants in both focus groups fuelled energetic discussions.

(D) Collection of artefacts to elicit the students' understanding of the teaching and learning process at the outset of the Grad Dip Programme. Examples of data collected included: PETE student assignments on 'Teaching Metaphor' (to capture students' views on the role of the teacher); Student Knowledge Questions' (to understand the types of knowledge that a student teacher thinks she might need); Student Shadow (shadowing two students in the TP school during observation weeks to understand how they experience school); 'Teacher Shadow' (shadowing a teacher who was perceived to be an excellent practitioner); 'Community Mapping' (charting the facilities available in the community which supported PE) and 'Rules, Routines and Expectations' (devising strategies for use the classroom). These artefacts provided a clear description of the prior knowledge of PETE students, thus charting the entry point of their learning at the outset of TP. This data informed the construction of the questionnaires distributed to the PETE students in September 2006 [see Appendix C p.301] and the formulation of the first interview questionnaire with PETE students during Cycle One Phase One (October/November 2006) [see Appendix D, p.311].

(E) In-depth interviews

By choosing the technique of in-depth interviewing for this study, the researcher made both a theoretical and methodological choice (Minichiello et al., 1995), which showed that the researcher favoured the interpretive tradition (ibid) using a participatory perspective. Earlier in this chapter, Guba & Lincoln, (2005) described the four elements of the Participatory view (Ethics, Epistemology, Ontology and Methodology). Keeping these aspects in mind, the researcher aimed to interpret the social reality of TP for the participants in the study, using a situative perspective. Clearly, in-depth interviewing is an appropriate method to gain access to an individual's words and interpretations (Minichiello et al., 1995). In-depth interviews require (1) skilled interviewing technique in order to (2) capture the research topic in context.

(a) The Skills of the Interviewer

Firstly, the interviewer must follow key steps in order to successfully engage in in-depth interviews (Fontana & Frey, 2005, pp.707-708)

(a) *Access the setting*: This was done by making a presentation on the proposed study to the PESS and EPS departments on June 22nd, 2006, and asking for permission to allow this study to be conducted with Greendale University PETE students and UTs [see Appendix A, p.283].

(b) *Understand the language and culture of the participants:* As the researcher was a graduate of Greendale University, a PE teacher for eleven years and a UT for three years, she understood the language and culture of all the participants.

(c) *Decide how to present oneself:* The researcher was honest with all participants from the outset. To avoid the participants feeling threatened by her presence, the researcher told the participants that she was not involved in the assessment of PETE students, that pseudonyms would be used throughout to protect the identity of participants and, ultimately, that she wanted to use the data to help improve the TP experience for all future PETE students. In addition, the researcher consulted all the participants in advance, regarding the timing of interviews.

(d) *Locate the informants:* The researcher was invited by the PESS and EPS departments to attend the Induction Week from August 21st- 25th 2006, during which she was introduced to the PETE students. Thereafter, the UTs, CTs and SPs associated with the PETE students could be contacted regarding participation in the study.

(e) *Gain trust:* Trust was gained with the participants through the researcher's open and transparent communication methods. The researcher respected the participants by listening attentively and reporting findings in an accurate manner. The researcher had to work much harder with three CTs to gain trust than with others in the study. This might have been because they thought erroneously, that the researcher was employed by Greendale University. By the second interview the trust had been established, as it was clear to these CTs that the researcher had no ulterior motive and wanted to improve the quality of future PETE student learning during TP.

(f) *Establish rapport:* Because the researcher knew the language and culture of the participants, a strong rapport was established quickly. The researcher also had effective communication skills and was able to elicit information quickly and effectively through active listening or listening for the meaning implied in participants' responses. In active listening, it is important not only that the listener has an orientation with the four qualities of empathy, acceptance, congruence and acceptance, but that the speaker feels that listener has this orientation (Fisher, 1993).

(g) *Collect empirical material:* The researcher collected detailed information using a dictaphone and took comprehensive notes after each interview. Added to this, the researcher used data collected to generate richer subsequent data. This was done by using data from one stage to inform the construction of the interview questions for the next stage e.g. data from each interview in Stage Three, Cycle One were used as fodder for each interview conducted in Stage Three, Cycle Two. This strategy was in line with the view that the interview was a:

> *Form of discourse between two or more speakers or as a linguistic event in which the meanings of questions and responses are contextually grounded and jointly constructed by interviewer and respondent* (Schwandt, 1997, p.79).

A skilled interviewer manages to maintain the context of the data generated such that it remains situated and authentic.

(b) <u>Capturing research topic in context:</u>

In this study, the researcher shared in the generation of the 'story' of the five case study participants on TP through in-depth interviews. In-depth interviews, by their nature, excavate into the topic being researched while maintaining the context of the data. Sarup (1996), captured this notion pointing to how in-depth interviews examined both the 'hows' and the 'whats' of storytelling which comprised:

> *Two parts: a story (histoire) and a discourse (discourse). The story is the content or chain of events. The story is the 'what' in a narrative and the discourse is the 'how'. The discourse is rather like a plot, how the reader becomes aware of what happened [and] the order of appearance of the events* (p.17).

Clearly, in-depth interviews reached both the 'hows' and the 'whats' of the TP experience for the participants in this study. The description of each PETE student's experience of TP, or the 'what' of storytelling, is captured in the

vignettes in chapters seven through eleven. The 'how' of storytelling, or the findings of the study are captured in chapters Twelve, Thirteen and Fourteen. In adopting such a strategy, the context of TP, as experienced by each of the case study participants, was preserved. This affirmed the notion that interview data and context were inextricably linked and therefore, the researcher should not extract the interview data out of the context in which it was gathered (Fontana & Frey, 2005).

Evidently, the key advantage to in-depth interviewing is that the researcher gains an insight into the situatedness of the participants. This, however presupposes that the participants will describe their experiences in a truthful manner (Minichiello et al., 1995). In this study, as was noted earlier, the researcher used crystallisation (Richardson, 2000), to look at the situation through the eyes of all participants and thus gain a more multifaceted view of the TP experiences described.

(F) Reflective journal Writing

Cooper (1991) says journal writing can serve as a form of self-reflection and self analysis. Furthermore, writing, as a reflective practitioner/student/person, is a method of inquiry that provides a research practice through which we can investigate both how we and others construct the world (Richardson, 2000). The author maintained a reflective journal throughout the study to capture researcher views at every stage of data collection. This journal served as an aide memoir, allowing the researcher to obtain a fuller picture of the case studies. Journal writing may be viewed as memo-writing which is a key construct of the qualitative data analysis tool: Grounded Theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Writing such memos allowed the researcher to further crystallise (Richardson, 2000) the data and build theory.

Chronological Account of Data Collection Methods

This section details the chronological order and detail of the data collection during this study. In all there were six stages. The relevant documents relating to each stage are found in the Appendices, where indicated.

Stage One: Presentation to Course Board of Grad Dip in Education (Physical Education) at Greendale University regarding Research Proposal.

22nd June, 2006

Two-hour PowerPoint presentation to Course Board comprising UTs from the Physical Education and Sports Science Department (PESS) and the Education and Professional Studies Department (EPS) [see Appendix A, p.283].

July and August 2006

Finalised all the covering letters and consent letters for the study's participants (PETE students, CTs, UTs and SPs).

Stage Two: Finding Participants (PETE students, CTs, UTs and SPs).

21st -25th August, 2006

(a) The researcher attended two days of Induction Week programme (day one and day five).

(b) The researcher made presentation to all seventeen PETE students on Grad Dip Programme outlining the study and requested volunteers to participate in the study.

(c) Five PETE students volunteered to participate in the study and all signed 'Consent Forms', at the researcher's request [see Appendix B, p.291].

(d) The researcher forwarded covering letters and consent letters to the SPs of the relevant five TP schools, and to the associated CTs therein [see Appendix B, p.291].

(e) The researcher forwarded covering and consent letters to the UTs assigned to each of the five PETE students [see Appendix B, p.291].

Stage Three: Data Collection Cycle One

September 2006

(a) All consent letters signed and returned by participants (CTs, UTs SPs)

(b) During Observation weeks open profile questionnaires were distributed to PETE students and to CTs [see Appendix C, p.301].

(c) Attendance at a PESS and EPS UT two-hour training session on September 13th 2006.

Stage Four: Data collection Cycle Two (Phase one and Phase two)

<u>September – December, 2006</u>

(a) During 'one-day-per-week' TP, data were collected twice in the form of in-depth interview questionnaires from PETE students and CTs [see Appendix D, p.311 & Appendix E, p.315]. Interviews were also conducted with one UT on 4th December 2006. The researcher observed a post lesson conference with UT, CT and PETE student on December 4th 2006.

(b) Collection of artefacts from PETE students (Teaching Metaphor, Student Knowledge Questions, Teacher Shadow, Student Shadow, Community Mapping, Rules Routine and Expectations).

Stage Five: Data collection Cycle Three

<u>January to March, 2007</u>

During the 'seven week block' TP, data were collected through:

(a) In-depth interview questionnaires with PETE students, CTs and SPs respectively [see Appendix F, p.322 & Appendix G, p.344].

(b) A Focus Group Interview with all five PETE students on March 29th 2008 [see Appendix H, p.347].

(c) A Focus Group with three UTs on January 17th 2008. [see Appendix I, p.352].

Stage Six: Presentation to PESS and EPS tutors on interim findings of study.

<u>September 28th, 2007 [</u>see Appendix K, p.364]

The summary table below captures the range of qualitative data collection methods used with the participants to answer the research questions posed in the opening chapter (see pp.3-4).

	Aoife	Barbara	Carol	Dara	Edel	UTs
Cycle One 3 weeks Observation	Open Profile Questionnaire September 06 Louise(CT) Aoife (ST)	Open Profile Questionnaire September 06 John (CT) Barbara (ST)	Open Profile Questionnaire September 06 Michael (CT) Carol (ST)	Open Profile Questionnaire September 06 Anita (CT) Dara (ST)	Open Profile Questionnaire September 06 Joan (CT) Edel (ST)	

Cycle Two **Phase One** **Phase Two** **1 day per week in schools**	**Interview (2)** 23/10/06 4/12/06 Louise(CT) Aoife (ST)	**Interview (2)** 9/10/06 13/11/06 John (CT) Barbara (ST)	**Interview (2)** 20/11/06 04/11/06 Michael (CT) Carol (ST)	**Interview (2)** 20/11/06 4/12/06 Anita (CT) Dara (ST) **Post lesson conference observation on** 4/12/06	**Interview (2)** 13/11/06 11/12/06 Joan (CT) Edel (ST)	**Interview** Liz (UT) 4/12/06 **Focus Group Interview UTs (17th Jan 07)** Claire, Noelle Sinead **Post lesson conference observation** 4/12/06
Cycle Three **7 weeks teaching block**	**Interview (1)** 13/02/07 Louise(CT) Aoife (ST) Mr. Kelly (SP) **Focus Group Interview** 29/03/07	**Interview (1)** 12/02/07 John (CT) Barbara (ST) Mr.Cotter (SP) **Focus Group Interview** 29/03/07	**Interview (1)** 16/02/07 Michael (CT) Carol (ST) Mr. O'Brien(DP) **Focus Group Interview** 29/03/07	**Interview (1)** 16/02/07 Anita (CT) Dara ST Mr. Clancy (SP) **Focus Group Interview** 29/03/07	**Interview (1)** 16/02/07 Joan (CT) Edel (ST) Mr. Noonan(SP) **Focus Group Interview** 29/03/07	

Table 4: Range of Data Collection Points throughout Study

Once data had been collected in this manner, the researcher became immersed in the data and used the grounded theory process to actively induct key themes.

Qualitative Data Analysis: Grounded Theory

The data analysis method adopted was that advocated by Strauss and Corbin (1998) i.e. Grounded Theory which spearheaded the 'qualitative revolution' (Charmaz, 2000). It is an inductive process of discovering theory from data (Pidgeon and Henwood, 2004). It means that the qualitative researcher has *"grounded their theory in data and validated their statements of relationship between concepts"* (Strauss & Corbin, 1998:5). This ensures that the researcher is confident about the conclusions he/she has reached and is convinced that they will withstand criticism from the target audience. This theory claims to reflect objectively on the data thus generating new understandings and theory (Pidgeon & Henwood, 2004). Hammersley (1989) questions whether, theory can simply 'emerge' from data, as the researcher is invariably working within a predetermined conceptual framework. Pidgeon & Henwood, (2004) concur with this preferring to refer to grounded theory as 'generation of theory'; a more constructivist approach that ensures that, as

Layder (1993) puts it, the data guide but do not limit the theorizing. In this study, a constructivist approach to grounded theory has been adopted. Grounded Theory also encourages a number of commendable researcher characteristics, according to Strauss and Corbin, (1998): critical analysis, recognising bias, abstract thinking, being responsive to criticism, sensitivity to data and immersion in the data analysis **procedures.**

Analytic Tools

Analytical tools were the devices used by the researcher to analyse the data in order to build *"creative, grounded and dense theory"* (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p.99). Strauss & Corbin (1998) liken the researcher to a craftsperson who uses specific tools to construct themes from the data. Just as a builder uses tools to build, so too the qualitiative analyst uses tools to build theory from data. The tools that can be harnessed by the qualitative researcher include questioning, analysis of a word, phrase or sentence, comparative analysis and ability to recognise personal bias. These tools become an extension of the researcher and are employed as required. In this study, the researcher used grounded theory to construct theory from data. The grounded theory **procedures** adopted for this study, included **'coding'** - *"conceptualising, reducing, elaborating and relating"* and **'writing of memos'** (ibid, p.12). Memo-writing was undertaken in tandem with 'coding' and stimulated by the activity of coding (ibid). Thus memos outlined the theories generated, linking the ideas on codes and the relationships between codes. Memos are a crucial stage in the data analysis process. If the analyst goes directly to sorting or writing, Glaser (1978) argues that the process cannot be described as grounded theory.

Grounded Theory consists of a process of "constant comparison" (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). There are three clear stages in this process, according to Strauss & Corbin (1990): open coding; axial coding; selective coding.

(a) <u>Step One: Open Coding</u> is the first crucial stage in the analysis, opening the door to the next phases. The data are broken down into discrete parts, closely examined and compared for similarities and differences (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p.102). Here, the researcher labels events and actions (coded) in the data

comparing them with one another to determine which data belong together (Harry, Sturges, & Klinger, 2005).

(b) Step Two: Axial Coding is the process where categories are related to their sub-categories. In other words, the codes are grouped according to what they have in common or clustered according to axes or points of intersection (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

(c) Step Three: Selective Coding involves the mechanism where the major categories are assimilated into a rich theoretical framework (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p.143).

Harry et al (2005) extrapolated Strauss & Corbin's grounded theory technique and proposed a six level approach, in an attempt to make the methodology as transparent and robust as possible. In this study, the decision was taken to follow Harry et al's (2005) six stages in the process of data analysis:

Level One and Level Two: *Derivation of open codes and conceptual categories* (Open and Axial coding) in initial interview data. Essentially, the data that were fractured during open coding are partially reassembled (ibid, p.124). It was key here to capture the essence of the five case studies in a fluid, flexible manner, so that the product is not too clinical (ibid, p.129). This meant, that data from each case study remained true to the 'authentic setting' (Fenwick, 1999) of each PETE student's TP experience. In this step the researcher was already beginning to abstract meaning from the data (Harry et al., 2005).

Level Three: *Developing Themes* (Selective coding). This mechanism formed the thematic findings of the study (Harry et al., 2005). In essence, the clusters were related to each other to determine the story or theme that they told (ibid).

Level Four: *Testing the Themes* – Here, the researcher interpreted the data and moved towards inducting theory. The researcher engaged in member-checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), or viewed data from a number of participants' perspectives. This is also known as crystallisation (Richardson, 2000). This step was important as it acknowledged that the researcher was often a relative insider in the field being researched, studying a topic that he/she knew quite well, and thus it may have been difficult to retain an appropriate distance.

Level Five: Interrelating the explanations – The themes are now referred to as explanations and are examined in an effort to determine why there are contradictions within explanations. What is interesting here is that no theme or explanation can stand in isolation from other themes; they are essentially interrelated. This was certainly the case in this study with each of the three themes intersecting with each other. The three themes are reported in Chapters Twelve, Thirteen and Fourteen, respectively.

Level Six: Delineating the Theory – Glaser and Strauss (1967) determined that there are two types of theory; formal and substantive. Formal theory is that which can be applied to a broad range of topics. Substantive theory implies that the theory only applies to the context being studied. In this study the theory generated was both formal and substantive. The formal theory regarding the optimum conditions for learning could be applied to any learning context. The theory relating to school-university partnerships and overt and hidden TP curriculum might be considered to be more substantive.

Two strategies were adopted when using this Grounded Theory approach. Firstly, the researcher 'hand-coded' the data from one case study using a Microsoft Word package. When the researcher was convinced that the analytical tools employed in this process were robust, and worked to good effect, a second strategy was employed where a qualitative data analysis software package was employed: ATLAS.ti.

Limitations to Grounded Theory

Harry et al (2005) identify two major limitations to grounded theory. The first relates to the fact that theory is inducted from the data, implying that the researcher is viewed as neutral to the process. However, in the current educational climate, research is often approached from an evaluative standpoint, with the researcher knowing a great deal about the subject at hand. Once this is acknowledged by the researcher, in a reflexive manner, it can add a richness to the study. This was certainly the case in this study, because, as has already been noted, the researcher had been a student of Greendale University, a PE teacher for eleven years and a UT for three years. Toma (2000) views such situations in a positive light: the researcher, an insider, can gather valuable qualitative data through collaboration between

herself and the subject because she *"cared deeply about what and whom [she was] studying* (p.177). The second limitation related to temporal issues inherent in grounded theory; often it is laborious and time-consuming. It is, therefore, important to ensure that the sample size is manageable in order to conduct a rich and meaningful study.

Grounded Theory Process in this Study

Level One and Level Two: Derivation of open codes and conceptual categories (Open and Axial Coding):

This involved the researcher labelling the concepts in each paragraph of data, by asking *"what categories, concepts or labels do I need in order to account for what is of importance to me in this paragraph*" (Pidgeon & Henwood, 2004, p.637). To do this a 'Table' for each source of data collected was created. A memo was written about each piece of data and then these fragments of data were colour-coded according to specific categories. An example of this is shown below in Table 5 indicating the process of conceptualising the data in the In-depth Interview Questionnaires. As was noted above, having identified key codes and related memos for one of the case studies using a Microsoft Word Package, the researcher then utilised the data analysis software package ATLAS.ti. to analyse all five case studies. This was done to ensure that the coding and memo-writing exercise were rigorous and robust.

Transcript	**Comment**
Int: Ok so you start. How helpful have they been and be real straight about this.	
Aoife: Ok, to be honest, I know the better teacher of the two PE teachers, I am not under her. I feel if I was under the other teacher for more experience at the start of the 3 weeks, I possibly would have learned more. Generally, feedback as a rule is	On what does she base this judgement? It is obvious that she is crying out for feedback. What kind of quality of feedback was given?

very brief after the class is rushing because they have maths class afterwards. I just literally, I have to go up nearly asking for feedback rather than being told feedback.	
Int: Ok is anything written down.	There does not seem to be a set format for feedback. This would be addressed within mentor training. Is this attitude linked to burnout?
Aoife: Occasionally but not very often.	
Int: Is it in duplicate. Remember ages ago she said she was going to have a book and that she would write in her stuff and you would write in your stuff.	
Aoife: No.	
Int: That's not happening at all.	
Aoife: No.	
Int: Ok, so why do you think the other person would be more helpful to you.	
Aoife: I just feel that she has more experience, she has more subject wise; more confident; maybe more informed about certain things. She just seems to be more efficiently organised whereas I find one teacher is more on the pally and gets along through the stuff; without any… you	This does not make sense because Louise has 26 years experience and Michelle has ten years. Does number of years teaching matter to your proficiency? Interesting that she sees personality, organisation skills, objective setting and content knowledge as being vital

don't see the key learning objectives in her class whereas in the other one you would.	components to good teaching. Also interesting that Louise is more pally to Aoife's face but to me criticises her?

Table 5: Level One – Derivation of Open Codes

In the next phase of Axial Coding, these categories were linked to sub-categories in designated individual Word Documents. Table 6 shows a sample from one Document on the category Mentor-Mentee Relationship and the sub-category 'Cloning Mentor-Mentee: goodness of fit/respect'.

Cycle One Questionnaire Aoife	
Friendly, professional and also approachable would best describe her style.	Is this the type of teacher that Aoife wants to emulate?
How does he/she view the role of the teacher? To help and facilitate student to be successful and improve on what their level of ability is…	Again, is this the type of teaching to which Aoife aspires?
How does he/she interact with the students? As a group to explain tasks out more often, to note it's done one to one as they work, giving them all time and feedback on work. **What aspects of teaching do they find most enjoyable?** Seeing them improve, progress in skills.	The language used may point to the fact that Aoife is in awe of this teacher and really wants to emulate her…

How does your teaching metaphor compare to this teacher's metaphor? Hers is based on bringing the best out in students, help one to one. Help to bring out their potential in their work.	Does she answer the question? Seems to be very like her own view which is that of facilitator. Is it also true that the ST will work best with a clone of themselves i.e. a teacher to whom they aspire.
Cycle One Questionnaire Aoife	
• Very organised • Calm • Collected • Identified weakness using good student to demonstrate?	Interesting choice of words to describe Aoife. Does she think that she shouldn't be calm given that she has little knowledge of the area? Acknowledges that Aoife realises that perhaps volleyball is not her strong point and uses student demo…
Safety Priority Organisation Balls rolling over the floor. It's the teaching fear if they don't do this, this year they may revert to coaching. (Links to "washout").	She is very disparaging of Aoife to me and yet behaves in the opposite way when Aoife is in front of her. Is this a personality issue? Is she a people pleaser? Afraid to give criticism?
a) What is the body language of both parties? Louise open/Aoife open	Positive belying the negative comments to me They are still trying to figure each other out? There may be some hope for the relationship at this point

Cycle Two Phase 1 Aoife	
Does Louise help you set up...or what kind of help does Louise give you... last week Louise observed and she did give me good feedback...the first week I just had a sub teacher in with me...so this week should be somewhat better. Things went a bit jeery last week so Louise helped me split up the group a small bit. I do like the idea of her coming in at any stage if she wishes...she tends to sit out and observe...	She seems hopeful that Louise will be available to her if things go awry?

Table 6: Level Two: Derivation of Axial Codes

Level Three: Developing Themes (Selective Coding) – The researcher began to determine which categories were dominant in the data. This was done by viewing the data catergories and determining which category encompassed the most data from the perspectives of all participants. It appeared that the themes most relevant at this point were: the mentor-mentee relationship, the school support of the mentee, Grad Dip course content [see Appendix J, p.356]

Level Four: Testing the Themes – This process involved member-checking (Rossman & Rallis, 1998) and crystallisation (Richardson, 2000) to ensure that the data were being represented in a transparent manner. This was done by interrogating what each participant had said about the theme identified. The process led to a more succinct group of three themes and sub-themes:

- The role of the cooperating teacher in supporting PETE student professional learning:
    a. Suitability of CT to mentor.
    b. CT expertise – career cycle of mentor.
    c. CT willingness to mentor – personality of mentor.
    d. CT mentoring expertise.

e. Goodness of fit between CT and PETE student.
f. Power relations between CT and PETE student

- The school-university relationship:
  a. Quality of CT-UT relationship
  b. School role on TP.
  c. University role on TP.
  d. Assessment.
  e. Quality of SP-UT relationship.
  f. View of university and school of best practice in teaching.
- The nature of PETE student learning on TP:
  a. What PETE student learns.
  b. How PETE student learns.
  c. Where PETE student learns.
  d. From whom PETE student learns.
  e. How the PETE student negotiates TP.

Level Five: Interrelating the Explanations - Because the themes were now grounded in extensive crystallised data (Richardson, 2000), the themes became explanations of the data (Harry et al., 2005). In trying to draw final conclusions, the researcher discovered that, ultimately, three factors impinged on PETE students' professional learning during TP. These were:

1. The role of the cooperating teacher in supporting PETE student professional learning (see Chapter Twelve).
2. The school-university relationship (see Chapter Thirteen).
3. The overt and hidden curriculum of Teaching Practice (see Chapter Fourteen).

Level Six: Delineating Theory – As outlined earlier in this chapter, this level involved determining formal and substantive theory. In this study the theory generated was both formal and substantive.

Mechanisms of Reporting Data

The researcher had used two key methods for reporting data:

(a) Crystallisation of data within case studies
(b) Relevant Theoretical Frameworks to organise thematic data.

Crystallisation of data within case studies

A key feature of this thesis is the way in which many views of the same issue are presented in a process of crystallisation (Richardson, 2000). Crystallisation happens twice in this study. Firstly, contextual data are reported from the participants of the five individual case studies through vignettes (see Chapters Seven to Eleven). Secondly, the opinions of many case study participants on specific issues are encapsulated in the three thematic chapters (see Chapters Twelve, Thirteen and Fourteen). It can be argued that this process offers a rich understanding of both the case study contexts *and* the key themes which have been inducted from the six-level grounded theory process (Harry et al., 2005). It is through this process of crystallisation (Richardson, 2000) that a contribution to existing literature on teacher education can be made.

Relevant Theoretical Frameworks to organise thematic data.

Having employed a rigorous six-level ground theory protocol (Harry et al., 2005), three key themes were identified from the data. In order to organise the reporting of data, specific theoretical frameworks were utilised in each chapter:

Theme One: The role of the cooperating teacher in supporting PETE student professional learning:

This theme was analysed and then reported using Huberman's (1989) professional career cycle as a pivotal organisational framework (see Chapter Twelve).

Theme Two: The school-university relationship:

The second theme utilised an adapted version of Huberman's (1989) professional career cycle to interrogate and report the one key aspect of these thematic findings (see Chapter Thirteen).

Theme Three: The overt and hidden curriculum of Teaching Practice:

This theme was discussed and analysed using PETE professional standards (see Chapter Fourteen). Specifically, the research was focused around the development of the PETE students in learning professional teaching standards in formal operation in Ireland. The researcher identified key components of student development by conducting a review of professional standards in the following publications:

(a) The Teaching Council of Ireland (2007) *"Codes for the Professional Conduct of Teachers"*.

(b) The United States (US) National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) (1995) document *"Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards"*.

(c) The US National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) (1989) document *"What teachers know and should be able to do"*.

Adapted for the Irish PETE context, and located in the context of Greendale Grad Dip documentation, it was helpful to consider PETE students' understanding in the following key hybrid 'standards':

1. PETE students are committed to pupils and pupil learning.
2. PETE students have strong pedagogical knowledge (PCK) in physical education.
3. PETE students are responsible for the management and assessment of pupil learning.
4. PETE students are reflective practitioners.
5. PETE students are members of learning communities.

In the absence of formal standards around which to assess student learning in this research, this was a compromise position.

As outlined earlier in this chapter, according to Strauss and Corbin (1998) the process of Grounded Theory fosters a number of laudible researcher characteristics, including recognising bias. What follows is a personal critical analysis in order to address this aspect.

Researcher Personal Critical Statement

"In a social process, people bend, spin consolidate and enrich their understandings" (Stake, 2005, p.454). The qualitative research process is such an entity comprising people: the researcher and the participants. This section addresses the notion of the *"insider/outsider status of the researcher"* (Minichiello et al., 1995, p.182). In this study, the researcher was very much an insider/outsider as, in addition, to conducting the research, she:

- Studied in the university at the centre of the study as a PETE student;
- Was supervised by untrained mentors/cooperating teachers during TP;

- Had acted as an untrained mentor/ cooperating teacher to PETE students from this university for eleven years;
- Had acted as an untrained UT representing this university and assessing PETE students on TP, although not to PETE students in this study.

In all of these roles, the impact of lack of training of key personnel to support PETE student learning on TP resonated strongly with the researcher. Therefore, when the opportunity arose, the researcher decided to study this issue which clearly involved the researcher choosing the research problem for both professional and personal reasons. In other words, she cared deeply about what and whom she was studying (Toma, 2000, p.177). Strauss & Corbin (1998) claim there are positive things to say about this complex inter-connection of the personal and the professional in research:

> *Choosing a research problem through the professional or personal experience route might seem more hazardous than doing so through the literature route. This is not necessarily the case. The touchstone of one's own experience might be a more valuable indicator of a potentially successful research endeavour than another more abstract source* (Strauss & Corbin, 1998, p.38).

The argument, essentially, is that having acknowledged the "*insider/outsider status of the researcher*" (Minichiello et al., 1995, p.182), a case can be made that reflexivity "*where researchers engage in explicit, self-aware analysis of their own role* (Finlay, 2002, p.531) can acknowledge and mediate for the bias in the study. Through a reflexive process, the researcher's humanity is accepted and celebrated. After all:

> *Researchers are not information gatherers, data processors or sense-makers of other people's lives; rather they are expected to be able to communicate with individuals and groups, to participate in appropriate cultural processes and practices and to interact in a dialogic manner with the research participants* (Bishop, 2005, p.120).

Clearly, one of the lynchpins of qualitative research is that during the research process, the researcher and participant form a symbiotic relationship where:

> *Information is not transmitted between researchers and individuals, instead information is co-created and data co-produced in a manner that preserves the existential nature of the information* (Eposito & Murphy, 2000, p.182).

In this way the researcher becomes a central data collection tool.

The researcher acknowledged that she had learned a great deal about the research process during this study. In particular, she discovered the following in relation to the data collection process:

(a) The importance of being honest with all participants regarding the nature of the study at hand in order instil trust and build a rapport.

(b) The need at times to give advice to participants when asked, as the researcher had a wealth of PCK and was viewed as an insider/outsider in the process (Minichiello et al., 1995, p.182).

(c) The need to be polite and considerate when dealing with participants, to ask if interview dates are suitable, and to thank them for their time on completion of interviews.

(d) The value of ensuring that interview questionnaires were planned and prepared in advance to (i) ensure that they built on data already collected, to elicit further rich data, (ii) maintained a clear link with research questions and (iii) ensured that the researcher had a script to guide discussion.

(e) The necessity to hone interview skills e.g. active listening (Fisher, 1993), such that participant answers could be mined for further data.

(f) The importance of actively valuing participant time and commitment to the study. The researcher sent thank you cards to all participants and also gave small personal gifts to the PETE students at the end of the data collection phase.

(g) The need to give something tangible to Greendale University. The researcher presented the Interim results of the study to PESS and EPS UTs in September 2007 and will issue a final report on the study to these Tutors on completion.

In relation to the data analysis process of grounded theory, the researcher learned:

(a) The value of employing a person to transcribe data immediately and efficiently, and for a reasonable cost.

(b) The importance of analysing the data as the study progressed so that data gathered could inform the questions posed at the next interview and thus elicit rich data.

(c) The necessity to hand-code data first before using ATLAS.ti. This assured the researcher that her modus operandi was robust.

(d) The need to constantly read literature on the codes identified, to begin the process of forming theory at an early stage.

Summary

This chapter has mapped the cartography of quantitative and qualitative methodologies traversing history, philosophy and negotiating the ethics, ontology, epistemology and methodology of these paradigms. Thereafter the choice of the qualitative paradigm as the framework for this study has been justified leading to a detailed outline of the qualitative data collection and data analysis methodologies used to answer the research questions posed in this study. The chapter closed with a personal account of the researcher's experience of the process as a data collection tool, and how she improved her researcher skills as data collector and analyst:

> *It is not just what the qualitative researcher does that is important, rather the way in which the social reality of people are being studied, understood and interpreted becomes one of the cultural motifs of qualitative research* (Bryman, 1988, p.8).

In the next five chapters, the stories of Aoife, Barbara, Carol, Dara and Edel and their experiences of TP are reported in the form of vignettes.

Chapter Seven: Case Study One - Aoife

Introduction

As was explained in previous chapters, this study has adopted a case study approach (Yin, 1994). It comprised one umbrella case study of Greendale university, schools and PETE students which consisted of five individual cases: tetrads of PETE student teacher, cooperating teacher (CT), University tutor (UT) and School Principal (SP). In chapters seven through eleven, the vignettes of each of these case studies are presented. A vignette is defined as a *"short, descriptive, literary sketch" (Wordnet, 2008b)* intended in this instance, to give the reader an insight into the workings of the case study and the interplay between case study participants in the context of supporting PETE student learning.

In this chapter, a vignette of Case Study One is presented. This case study has PETE student Aoife at the centre, surrounded by three other participants: Louise, the cooperating teacher (CT), Noelle, the Greendale University Tutor (UT) and Mr. Kelly, the School Principal (SP) of TowerHill Girls Secondary School. This vignette is divided into two key aspects:

1. Biography and views of participants on the TP process
2. The relationships between key participants in the tetrad.

Biography and Views of Participants on the TP Process.

Initially, a brief biography of the participants is given followed by an illustration of their views on effective PE teaching, mentoring within Teacher Education and the role of the school and university in TP.

(a) Aoife (PETE student)

Aoife had a very active lifestyle with hobbies including athletics, swimming and tag-rugby. She described herself as *"outgoing, independent"* (PETE student, Aoife, Questionnaire, September 2006). Aoife enjoyed *"working with people, especially kids"* and explained how she had *"always wanted to do PE teaching, but never would have obtained such high points"* (PETE student, Aoife, Questionnaire, September 2006). To explain this point, in Ireland,

pupils in the final year of Secondary school study for and sit a Leaving Certificate examination. They obtain points for their examination results and these points determine their acceptance for a university course. Because Aoife did not attain enough points for the four-year degree programme at Greendale University, she decided to pursue a different pathway into this career. She studied for five years to obtain her primary degree in Health, Fitness and Leisure Studies at Brightwater University. As this was not a teaching degree, she then entered the one-year Grad Dip Programme at Greendale University to gain this qualification. Aoife saw her teaching role as *"teaching new information to people"* (PETE student, Aoife, Questionnaire, September 2006). Prior to entering Greendale University, Aoife had been mentored at Brightwater university and, based on this experience, viewed a mentor was *"someone we can touch base with, learn from and seek advice on how to improve our skills"* (PETE student, Aoife, Questionnaire, September 2006). Aoife added that a mentor was:

> *Someone who strikes me as helpful even when I'm not necessarily asking for their help... more an assistant to help develop skills or ideas I may have had.*
> (PETE student, Aoife, Questionnaire, September 2006).

(b) Louise (CT)

Aoife's cooperating teacher (CT), Louise, had twenty-six years PE teaching experience, the majority of which had been in Towerhill school. Louise was also a Mathematics teacher. Louise felt overwhelmed by her work as a CT saying that *"the work of a CT is extra work and makes [me] feel frazzled"* (CT, Louise, Interview 1,October, 23rd 2006). Commenting on Louise's teaching, Mr. Kelly, the School Principal (SP), felt that Louise was:

> *Just coasting, she wasn't being challenged in any way in her job...(he) didn't know how to deal with her because she is so bright and intelligent that really all her ....her talents were not being utilised properly.* (SP, Mr. Kelly, Interview 1 Principal, 13th February, 2007).

Until recently, Louise had not engaged in any formal Professional Development for many years. However, of late, on the recommendation of a Government PE inspection team, she attended an In-Service course in Gymnastics:

> *And really like that she had a PE inspection and that was the only reason that she had gone to In-service. She hadn't attended In-service in many, many years.* (SP, Mr. Kelly, Interview Principal, 13th February 2007).

Louise appeared to be overburdened by her work at school. In her opinion, the PETE students from the Greendale four-year degree programme were easier to supervise on TP as they had, in her view, a wider PCK than PETE students on the Grad Dip Programme.

(c) Noelle (UT)

Noelle, Aoife's university tutor (UT), entered the initial teacher education (ITE) field through the ITE research route, and had taught in a university setting for her entire career:

> *I taught as a graduate assistant to students and staff members of a university setting.* (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

Noelle, having never taught PE in schools, struggled with this gap in experience and felt that it might impact on her credibility as a UT with both PETE students and SPs:

> *So, sometimes I am conscious of me being the right... best placed person to give students feedback in relation to their learning within the school environment.*
> *I would have a dilemma in relation to my own involvement in supervising, and sometimes it's mentioned to me and other times it's not, in relation to my own involvement or lack of involvement within school physical education.* (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

Greendale University did not offer training to Noelle to try to bridge this gap. In fact Noelle was expected to up-skill herself. She:

> *Never went through any formal training. I was put into schools and from there I have been learning on the job.* (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

Noelle ensured that she understood the policies and practice around TP by studying the relevant documentation and current research on curriculum and pedagogical approaches:

> *I was following documents, so procedures, you wouldn't catch me out on any of them. It was documents I was following, as opposed to experience that allowed me to inform my practice. But, that aside, I would have gone out of my way to make sure that I was fairly up-to-date, I know what the process.... procedures are, processes, and lecturing to them in areas that are being.... being looked at it in schools* (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

Noelle was anxious to improve her expertise as she recognised the importance of the role of UT on TP and the impact of the UT on PETE student learning:

> *Probably the actual investment, level of investment, that teaching practice allows you within...in individual students. That and the final year project are probably the only*

two instances where you actually get to spend time with the student and get to see them develop (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

Noelle did outline some frustrations with the design of TP at Greendale University. In particular, Noelle felt that the current TP grading process was unjust and unilateral, with the UT in an omnipotent role and the CT as passive in the process:

We [UT and CT] can have these conversations without prejudice to a grade, you know. Now ...but.... you see I am looking at that from my perspective and I feel I do as much as I can to put that relationship in place. But in reality you know it's not an even playing pitch. And I will make the call at the end of the day (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

This led Noelle to comment that PETE students were not treated equally, when graded on TP performance:

Procedurally, my frustration is that I don't think all students are being treated...I am not saying equally.... but in a similar way, in relation to levels of support, levels of investment, fairness (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

The lack of fairness in the system was also due to the varying input of the CT on TP. In some schools, the CT was very supportive of PETE student learning and, in others, this support was not available to the PETE student. Therefore, PETE students did not have the same learning experiences:

We could take it away from ourselves and...and involve the co-operating teachers so much more. I have seen instances where I don't think the co-operating teacher has been having an input (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

In addition to this learning support, Noelle would value the involvement of the CT in grading the PETE student TP performance. This was because CTs saw the PETE student teaching everyday and could, therefore, give a full picture of PETE student progress on TP as:

I can never know how entirely honest they (PETE students) are being. I mean I get to see essentially, you know, a snapshot of the day or the two days that I go and what I see in the...the folder (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

As PETE students knew that CTs were not consulted formally on their progress, the students tended to produce showcase lessons for the UT which may not have resembled their lessons during the rest of TP:

And the co-operating teacher said, that was the best lesson and the only lesson that the student performed effectively the whole nine weeks. So he was saying to me, you know, you have seen a pass lesson, but it has been constructed for your visit. (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

Interestingly, Noelle also felt that the SP had a potentially powerful role and must be included in the assessment process, in addition to the CT and UT:

> *I just wonder if we should be doing more work...well we talk about co-operating teachers all the time. But is the principal the actual...the gatekeeper for that?* (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

(d) Mr. Kelly (SP)

According to Mr. Kelly, it had been thirty-one years since he did his Higher Diploma in Education. He had been Principal of Towerhill Secondary School for ten years. Mr. Kelly described allowing student teachers from seven different teacher education institutions to do TP in his school. He felt the school could not refuse such requests and said, *"we are a soft touch"* (SP, Mr. Kelly, Interview Principal, February 13th 2007) because a number of these institutions are training former pupils from Towerhill and *"your hand is half twisted I think, you know"* (SP, Mr. Kelly, Interview Principal, February 13th 2007). Mr. Kelly appeared to feel frustrated at being in this position:

> *I think we are going to have to do something about it, because I can't facilitate seven different groups coming in all the time. It wouldn't be good for the school even though the staff here are very good I think at helping the students [teachers]* (SP, Mr. Kelly, Interview Principal, February 13th 2007).

When asked if the school had a mentoring programme in place for this number of student teachers, Mr. Kelly responded that:

> *No, we have nothing. There was a mentoring pilot programme came out this year. We chose not to go into it. We just said, we will leave it go further on a bit* (SP, Mr. Kelly, Interview Principal, February 13th 2007).

This was interesting given that Mr. Kelly himself, had been mentored as a student teacher and clearly valued the experience. He spoke fondly of his mentor, softening his tone:

> *The first time I ever went into the staff room, going back doing the Dip, there was this guy who taught me ....a master of six years and he kind of looked at me, and says, he says, what are you doing here? You know? I said...I said, Sir, I don't know myself really, to be honest with you. But he was very helpful to me during the year...so like he died then playing golf ten years ago* (SP, Mr. Kelly, Interview Principal, February 13th 2007).

When probed further on whether the school has any policies in place to induct student teachers, Mr. Kelly said:

> *I am not so sure we have anything written down. No...but like they would be included as a normal part of subject meetings or staff meetings. You know, they wouldn't be*

excluded that way. There is no...[cough] excuse me. There is no separate room or anything like that for them. They are up in the staff room where they are with everybody (SP, Mr. Kelly, Interview Principal, February 13th 2007).

From this, it was clear that the school did not have formal structures in place to support student teacher learning. However, Mr. Kelly acknowledged the informal learning support given by cooperating teachers (CT) to these students, for example:

We have two PE teachers here and they are good ...and they bent over backwards, they did everything to try and help her [Aoife] (SP, Mr. Kelly, Interview Principal, February 13th 2007).

When asked how the school rewarded CTs for such efforts Mr. Kelly said *"I am sure the students [teachers] probably give them a little something at the end"* (SP, Mr. Kelly, Interview Principal, February 13th 2007).

The Relationships between Key Participants in the Tetrad

(a) The relationship between Aoife (PETE student) and Louise (CT)

<u>From Aoife's perspective:</u>

From the outset of TP, Aoife's view of a mentor or CT was:

Someone who strikes me as helpful even when I'm not necessarily asking for their help... more an assistant to help develop skills or ideas I may have had. (PETE student, Aoife, Questionnaire, September 2006).

It was clear that Aoife welcomed Louise supporting her learning. She liked the *"idea of her [Louise] coming in at any stage if she wishes"* (PETE student, Aoife, Interview 1, October 23rd 2006). However, it became apparent that such a level of support would not be forthcoming: *"she [Louise] tends to sit out and observe"* (PETE student, Aoife, Interview 1, October 23rd 2006). By the end of TP this behaviour had diminished to:

Ya, like I would just get the Hi. Are you ok? Do you know what you are doing for the next class and that's it (PETE student, Aoife, Focus Group Interview, March 29th 2007).

Even when Aoife did give lesson plans to her CTs, she did not receive any feedback from them, so it became a pointless exercise:

Like I have...I have given my session plans to both teachers [Louise and Imelda]. The first week...yes, the first week all...I printed everything out. And I have had no feedback even from that (PETE student, Aoife, Interview 3, February 13th 2007).

The CTs were also not available for consultation between classes:

You would rarely get to see her [Louise]. I wouldn't see her. I am always around here from 9.00 to 3.30. I have never left early you know at any stage. And like I would

> *only see them [Louise and Imelda] at my PE class time, you know, between their...their other class assigned. Like I don't get to talk to them and then when they come into the canteen, you don't want to be specifically sitting on their...on their lap, you know asking them stuff* (PETE student, Aoife, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

Therefore, in the first four months of TP, Aoife began to control how she was being mentored and would only allow Louise *"to see the lesson plan if she wanted her to see it"* (PETE student, Aoife, Interview 1, October 23rd, 2006). This led to situations where Louise was very critical of lesson content. For example, after one volleyball lesson, she commented that Aoife's *"doing the dig, we don't do that until 3rd year"* (CT, Louise, Interview 1, October 23rd 2006). Aoife wanted some learning support from her CT to progress when she said *"at the same time you want a bit of guidance at least"* (PETE student, Aoife, Interview 3, February 13th 2007). But, this 'guidance' seemed to be only acceptable on Aoife's terms. In the absence of structured CT guidance, Aoife described feeling totally unsupported in her learning and having to drive her own development within TP. Aoife felt frustrated by this:

> *I am doing everything to try and make myself move on but there is only so much I can do... I just need somebody just...because I...I am just kind of so in a rut. I just need someone...*(PETE student, Aoife, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

Even in the last cycle of TP, it was clear that Aoife still wanted Louise to support her learning. At this point, she grappled with confronting Louise on this issue:

> *I suppose I could speak up at the end of the day, and say, look, sit in on all my classes, tell me what I am doing wrong and I...you know, I could adopt that approach* (PETE student, Aoife, Interview 3, February 13th 2007).

But was afraid that Louise's reaction might be overwhelming:

> *Well yes...like...like there is nothing worse than you want to come in and you feel like you are being assessed every single day of the week* (PETE student, Aoife, Interview 3, February 13th 2007).

Which might lead to a very pressurised situation for Aoife on TP:

> *But I feel like I would...you know, I personally would feel claustrophobic if that was happening every single day of the week...it's bad enough knowing that we are going to be assessed this term, besides being assessed every single class that I teach* (PETE student, Aoife, Interview 3, February 13th 2007).

It seemed, that the reason Aoife wanted learning support, was that she had realised that her PCK was inadequate. This was partly due to the fact that Aoife perceived that *"both Imelda [the other CT] and Louise were looking*

down their noses at her" (PETE student, Aoife, Interview 2, December 4th 2006) because she had entered PE teacher training through a Brightwater degree combined with a Grad Dip and not the four-year Greendale PE teaching degree. It seemed that both CTs *"didn't feel that she was up to scratch [with her PCK]"* (PETE student, Aoife, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). Aoife admitted that Louise and Imelda might be right in this view:

> *Well, after mid term break I am doing badminton. And I would have done that in college...or in Brightwater years ago, like I wouldn't have specifically done it, just as in myself. Again...so I brushed up on that. I have athletics. I have never taught that. I have taught in a club level. But that's completely different than teaching in a school. I am doing dancing, again I wasn't familiar with teaching it until last block* (PETE student, Aoife, Interview 3, February 13th 2007).

In this description, Aoife added her lack of PCK in badminton and athletics to the already growing list of PE areas, in which she displayed a dearth of PCK i.e. basketball, volleyball, swimming and gymnastics.

By the end of TP, Aoife changed from appearing defeatist about the lack of CT learning support and showed a new resilience: *"Oh I am very independent now" (PETE student, Aoife, Interview 3, February 13th 2007).* In spite of this, she still believed that PETE students should not have to endure unsupported learning on TP and that CTs should be compelled to offer formal learning support to PETE students:

> *I think...I think there should be a class assigned to them a week that they have to sit down with the student and talk to the student, or two at least would be of benefit to both parties, you know, that they could talk through stuff. Even if it was to talk through plans or issues or even...like classes, like do you know problems that they are having in the class, you know, that they know all the class members and stuff like that* (PETE student, Aoife, Focus Group Interview, March 29th 2007).

<u>From Louise's perspective:</u>

Initially, Louise (CT) commented that Aoife was *"very organised, calm, collected. She has presence"* (CT, Louise, Interview 1, October 23rd 2006). These were qualities that Louise clearly admired and valued in a teacher. In addition, she admired Aoife's resourcefulness when she noticed that, in spite of Aoife's insufficient volleyball PCK, "*She covered her own inability to demonstrate volleyball skills by using a good student to demonstrate"* (CT, Louise, Interview 1, October 23rd, 2006).

Louise felt that she was not furnished, in advance of TP, with adequate information on Aoife's prior PCK. This posed a number of difficulties in terms of assigning class groups to Aoife. Louise found it frustrating and *"difficult to plan for the arrival of a student teacher without knowing his/her prior knowledge"* (CT, Louise, Interview 1, October 23rd, 2006). She tended to find out about Aoife's PCK as TP progressed. For example, she discovered that Aoife was incapable of teaching volleyball: *"volleyball is timetabled but may have to change timetable as Aoife does not have prior knowledge of volleyball"* (CT, Louise, Interview 1, October 23rd 2006). Louise then asked Aoife to outline her PCK in specific areas and it seemed that Aoife was unable to do this. For example, *"Aoife said that swimming was her forte and when she took swimming class she did side-stroke with the beginners"* (CT, Louise, Interview 1, October 23rd, 2006). To counteract this, Louise suggested that Greendale University should send the PETE student's curriculum vitae in advance of TP:

> *PETE student curriculum vitae should be supplied to school so that CTs can plan lessons and change around programme to suit expertise of PETE student* (CT, Louise, Interview 1, October 23rd 2006).

Aoife's limited PCK appeared to cause many problems during TP. By the second interview in December 2006, Louise was clearly frustrated:

> *With basketball, Imelda's class, last week, were doing a lay-up. Aoife was doing one, two, three and up. Anybody who has ever even watched a game of basketball knows that there are two steps for a lay-up. Do you know what I mean? That's the maximum number. Imelda had to interrupt, doing it without the girls knowing and say change the drill; we are reducing the steps to two...It's scary* (CT, Louise, Interview 2, December 4th, 2006).

Louise appeared to be exasperated by this, because Aoife was wasting teaching opportunities that Louise would have to amend later with the pupils. Because of this, Louise said that she would not have Grad Dip Students for TP again:

> *It's so hard on us that our classes are being taught incorrectly, it's just major work and we wouldn't do it again with these... They really have to do the basics. As I said to you it is really hard work on us as PE teacher seeing our class. They have one class a week and what we'd say it's nearly wasted. Unless we intervene, it's been wasted* (CT, Louise, Interview 2, December 4th, 2006).

Louise identified *"lack of knowledge"* as a key stumbling block to Aoife's progress during TP (CT, Louise, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). She was aware that Aoife was trying to supplement her PCK *"from a book"* as there was *"a lot of theory"* (CT, Louise, Interview 2, December 4th, 2006). It was also clear that Aoife was unable to break down this information into PCK suitable for the classes she was teaching. To support her argument, Louise said:

> *I see a lot of theory, a lot of written stuff, a lot of written stuff for the girls; handouts and stuff...they are at the wrong level...they are too advanced* (CT, Louise, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

Louise cited Aoife's dance class as a particular example of this:

> *It was okay, but it reminded me of the in-services last week, it was like a dance course in one class...a lot of theory on the walls. She could have kept it a lot simpler. But the dance was, was ok, was fine; could have been a lot more basic and they would have had a lot more fun if she just kept it basic...she was analysing what they were doing too much* (CT, Louise, Interview 2, December 4th, 2006).

This problem seemed to traverse other lessons as Louise commented that generally Aoife had a difficulty planning an appropriate amount of material for lessons:

> *More often than not, the biggest problem is timing, trying to do 10 classes in one, kind of thing* (CT, Louise, Interview 2, December 4th, 2006).

Louise was also concerned about Aoife's consideration of safety in lessons:

> *And again, the safety issues. Again with basketball, when she started with basketball, both myself and Imelda were there. She started with something like a 12 against 12 games with one ball. There are 24 balls* (CT, Louise, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

This led Louise to infer from Aoife's lack of PCK in many key areas and inadequate safety precautions, that Aoife should not be allowed to teach gymnastics on TP:

> *I wouldn't be happy with her teaching gymnastics, especially like.... even having done In-service lately now I am going back over all the safety and.... it's even worse than when you know... in the previous years you know, you...you really have to cover all the...all the stages. And I just don't think she is capable of it just judging by the lack of knowledge* (CT, Louise, Interview 2, December 4th, 2006).

However, in the final interview on 13th February 2006, Louise did admit that in the one activity where Aoife *had* relevant PCK, her lesson showed a marked improvement:

> *Yes...now I noticed...the one thing I have noticed is...the one sport that she has ...that I know she has experience in, it's the tag rugby thing, and it's the one...and she is doing it with Leaving Certs which would be the harder group to be with. But it's the best class because she has the experience. She does, yes. And she...you know, she is not giving it from the book. She is giving it from her own experience* (CT, Louise, Interview 3, February 13th 2007).

Aoife had indicated in September 2006, that tag-rugby was one of her hobbies.

When asked about how and when Louise gave feedback to Aoife, Louise explained that often feedback was given *after* the lesson. Therefore, these PCK issues were not identified in advance of the lesson to give Aoife time to address them. From Louise's perspective, Aoife seemed reticent to accept feedback on her performance:

> *Well she is a very confident person anyway. I have to say now she is very, very open to criticism on stuff but she does come across as very confident and tries to get through her plan without interruption*...(CT, Louise, Interview 2, December 4th 2007).

Further supporting Aoife's approach to feedback, Louise noted that Aoife:

> *Presented us with her schemes of work and her lesson plans and the whole lot in advance... like we said to her, now about the lesson plans, you know, that she has to be much more adaptable, that she can't just have the lesson plans planned because you know one lesson plan depends on the previous one, that type of thing...really it is the schemes of work you operate from and then the lesson plans*
> (CT, Louise, Interview 2, February 13th 2007).

It seemed that Aoife wanted to proceed with her own strategy of planning everything in advance, while she pretended to the UTs that she planned according to university protocol which was based on CT feedback and reflection on each lesson:

> *Well, I have provided them what I am doing for the whole duration of the seven blocks.... weeks. Now my supervisors [university tutors] wouldn't realise that I have actually planned out each session ...like you know, I wouldn't have let it known that I had planned out each of my sessions in advance as far as they considered, I am planning as I go along* (CT, Louise, Interview 2, February 13th 2007).

During the final TP cycle in February 2006, Louise felt that there was a *"definite improvement"* (CT, Louise, Interview 3, February 13th 2007) in Aoife's teaching performance specifically in relation to classroom management. Aoife

continued to have an authority in class, which had been noted in the first interview:

> *Like she is...when...when you go to the classroom and you are watching her, you know she is there, number one. You can hear her. And she does get their attention*...(CT, Louise, Interview 3, February 13th 2007).

She also felt that Aoife's attention to safety had improved:

> *She is more aware of safety. Again that comes with experience too. You know, there would be still the odd instant that you would have to remind her, but yes, she has improved, yes* (CT, Louise, Interview 3, February 13th 2007).

In addition, Louise observed that Aoife continued to address time management issues:

> *Actually, it is funny, because she went the opposite, in that she ....she was letting them off. And I was saying, no, there is another.... at least another ten minutes to go. So...we had the joke...we were just saying, you will get it right eventually* (CT, Louise, Interview 3, February 13th 2007).

In spite of such improvements she still felt that overall it was *"the knowledge [PCK] I would be worried about"* (CT, Louise, Interview 3, February 13th 2007).

(b) The relationship between Aoife (PETE student) and Noelle (UT)

Aoife clearly respected her UTs, and in the absence of formal tutor-instigated meetings, engaged with them only when *she* thought it was necessary:

> *Well I just...I would approach them...I wouldn't be a person now that would go knocking like as much as some people I know...continuously you know to lecturers* (PETE student, Aoife Interview 3, February 13th 2007).

Aoife knew that if she needed them, they were *"very approachable"* (PETE student, Interview 3, February 13th 2007). She preferred having formal ongoing meetings instigated by the UT, rather than ad hoc meetings prompted by the PETE student:

> *I wouldn't have that much contact besides you know my lectures with them. Although saying that, Sinead [UT from EPS] would have very regular meetings with us and always asks us how we are getting on. If I feel I need to ask Noelle anything, I see her most days* (PETE student, Aoife, Interview 3, February 13th 2007).

When interviewed about the TP assessment process, Aoife expressed surprise that the CT and the UT shared their views of her performance. Subsequently, she thought that:

Well, I suppose I would like to have time on my own with the tutor. And then bring in the cooperating teacher, like because, I think if there is a type of person there, they can influence a lot of decision making or any points that might come out
(PETE student, Aoife, Interview 3, February 13th 2007).

When pressed about the CT having more power in the grading process, Aoife implied that there needed to be a good personal relationship between the PETE student and the CT for this to occur:

That would only work in an ideal situation, if you got on with all three parties [CT, UT] ...because my relationship and the feedback mightn't be as good as many other schools. Although I have an ideal situation when like I don't dread coming here but at the same time, I feel I don't get as much input from the school that I would have hoped (PETE student, Interview 3, February 13th 2007).

(c) The relationship between Aoife (PETE student) and Mr. Kelly (SP)

Aoife describes her only interaction with the Principal during her seven-month TP:

Actually I have had one discussion with the Principal. There was a...he was just general...a conversation I think about my ex Principal. But he was saying that...my Principal from my old school is retiring. And I said...God.... I said, do you know, it's bad enough organising classes and being responsible for a class, not to mind the skill like...do you know...of being a Principal (PETE student, Aoife, Interview 3 February 13th 2007).

Mr. Kelly seemed gratified by this comment and responded that he *"had heard from her CTs that she was progressing well"* (PETE student, Aoife, Interview 3, February 3th 2007). When this was shared with Aoife, she was surprised that Louise (CT) said positive things about her to the Principal:

As far as I am hearing, you know, you are doing a good job in it. You know...so...you know, it was nice to hear that from the Principal obviously. You know, that had to be fed up from...from staff (PETE student, Aoife, Interview Principal, February 13th, 2007).

In a separate interview he reiterated this sentiment that Aoife would be a good teacher: "*And that girl we have there now at the moment, Aoife, she will be a joy*" (SP, Mr. Kelly, Interview 1, February 13th, 2007). When asked whether he would employ her, however, he recognised that her eligibility for employment decreased because she had one subject to offer schools: *"but her disadvantage she has only the one subject, she has only PE"* (SP, Mr. Kelly, Interview Principal, February 13th, 2007). PETE students on the Grad

Dip also study a thirty-hour course in Social, Personal and Health education (SPHE) to qualify them to teach it in schools. SPHE is a compulsory non-examination subject taught for forty minutes per week to First, Second and Third Year Students in Secondary school. Some PETE students did not teach SPHE on TP, which may have lead Mr. Kelly to believe that Aoife could only teach one subject.

(d) The relationship between Louise (CT) and Noelle (UT)

Louise was dissatisfied with the lack of Grad Dip PETE student information provided by the university prior to TP:

> *One visit and no background from them about what they expect, or what they expect us to do. We know from Greendale University because we've been there and we have students coming out. We got no information as to what did they want us to do extra with these people seeing as they haven't got the same background [PCK]* (CT, Louise, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

In addition to this, Louise did not feel that the new Grad Dip programme was effective in training PE teachers, and she voiced her concern to Noelle:

> *She [Louise] thought the student couldn't possibly become a P.E. teacher on a one-year course and pointed out to her the basic knowledge that was lacking* (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

Noelle defended the Grad Dip programme content:

> *She passed that off as 'well in the College, we are not doing every game and we are doing games for understanding' and...was saying there is transfer from one to another* (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 2007).

In response, Louise argued that:

> *There is no transfer to swimming and I explained that's what I thought. You get in the water and you can't just transfer from something else you have done. You have to know the basics before you start swimming. There is very little transfer for volleyball because it is a particular skill you need to know about* (CT, Louise, Interview 2, December 4th 2006)

Louise was very unhappy with Noelle's response to her criticism of the Grad Dip programme and felt that she should have listened:

> *Well, I...I just felt...if this is a course that they are taking on in the college that they...you know, they should be interested* (UT, Louise, Interview 2, December 4th, 2006).

In terms of Noelle consulting with Louise on Aoife's learning progress, Louise stayed for one class and met her afterward, however the critique was *"never*

shown to her" (CT, Louise, Interview 3, February 13th 2007). Louise was excluded from the assessment process.

(e) The relationship between Louise (CT) and Mr. Kelly (Principal)

Notwithstanding the fact that there were student teachers from seven different institutions in the school on TP, Louise (CT) did not feel supported by the school to do her CT work:

> *No. Oh God, no, no. And there is no time allowance or anything like that. Like I mean everybody...we all...we are all of the opinion to help with all these raw young students and we do our best. But it comes from the goodwill of the teachers, yes. There is no real policy on it* (CT, Louise, Interview 1, October 23rd 2006).

In addition, Louise was not rewarded directly for her CT work with Aoife by the School Principal. As was noted earlier, Mr. Kelly, seemed to believe that it was the student teachers who needed to show their gratitude to CTs:

> *I am sure the students [teachers] probably give them a little something at the end* (SP, Mr. Kelly, Interview Principal, 13th February 2007).

(f) The relationship between Noelle (UT) and Mr. Kelly (SP)

Mr. Kelly (Principal) wanted UTs to follow protocol and visit the school office on entering the school before going to the PE hall to announce their presence, and he had *"occasion to contact the university when this protocol was not observed"* (SP, Mr. Kelly, Interview 3, February 13th 2007). One UT, Noelle, had realised the power of the School Principal in the TP. While other UTs seemed to only refer to the CT, Noelle recognised that the School Principal had the ultimate power in TP and described him/her as a *"gatekeeper"* (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007) for the quality of the TP process. It was surprising that, in spite of this observation, Noelle did not engage with him regarding Aoife's learning progress during TP.

Summary

Aoife felt unsupported in her learning by Louise (CT). She grappled with demanding attention and help from her, but was afraid that she might be overwhelmed by support from Louise if she did this. With regard to UT support, Aoife engaged with UTs only when they requested meetings with her. She did not instigate meetings with her UTs as she did not think that PETE students should do this. In the absence of formal learning support, Aoife

sought PCK from books and the Internet and often found it difficult to translate this material into useful lesson content. She was cautious about the CT and UT having dual control of TP assessment. This was because she thought that PETE students often did not have good personal relationships with CTs. She preferred the current system where the UT had unilateral power in the process.

Louise (CT) was very unhappy with Aoife's level of PCK and classroom management skills. When she shared this with Noelle (UT), Noelle responded defensively about this. Louise was angry at this reaction to her criticism and thought that Noelle would have been receptive to feedback from CTs on the Grad Dip programme.

Noelle (UT) felt insecure about her entry point to tutoring in teacher education, not having PE teaching experience in schools. To counteract the dearth of tutor training at Greendale University, Noelle worked hard to bolster her knowledge initially through gaining in-depth knowledge of TP policies and procedures and more recently through *"learning on the job"* in schools. Noelle believed that the CT should have a more sustained role in TP supervision and assessment to *"level the playing field"* for PETE students (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007). In addition, Noelle recognised that the School Principal played a key role in TP describing him/her as a *"gatekeeper"* and that he/she should be consulted regarding the delivery of TP in schools (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007) for TP.

TowerHill Girls Secondary Schools did not have a formal mentoring or induction policy for student teachers. This was in spite of the fact, that seven teacher education institutions used the school as a TP site each year.

Chapter Eight: Case Study Two - Barbara

Introduction

In this chapter, a vignette of Case Study Two is presented. This case study has PETE student Barbara at the centre, surrounded by three other participants: John, the cooperating teacher (CT), Claire, the Greendale University Tutor (UT) and Mr. Cotter, the School Principal (SP) of Byron's Way Girls Secondary School. This vignette is divided into two key aspects:

1. Biography and views of participants on the TP process.
2. The relationships between key participants in the tetrad.

Biography and Views of Participants on the TP Process.

(a) Barbara (PETE student)

Similar to Aoife, Barbara did not have sufficient points from her Leaving Certificate to gain a place on the four-year degree course at Greendale University. Therefore, she studied for five years at Brightwater University to complete a B.Sc. degree in Health Fitness and Leisure Studies. She then applied to do the Grad Dip programme to become a PE teacher. Barbara always wanted to be a PE teacher and saw the role of the teacher as to *"help students learn and encourage them to reach their potential"* (PETE student, Barbara, Questionnaire, September 2006). Barbara was a qualified lifeguard, aqua jogging instructor, fitness and conditioning instructor for Gaelic Games teams, and swimming and diving teacher. In addition, Barbara listed camogie, tennis and basketball as her hobbies. When Barbara was asked to identify significant people who had supported her learning, she described her father who was her mentor, and said *"mentors are good; they can help you learn new things and answer questions you may have. They are also good to bounce ideas off"* (PETE student, Barbara, Questionnaire, September 2006).

(b) John (CT)

John had been teaching PE and English for the past five years. He chose to become a PE teacher because he had *"good PE teacher role models"* and he commented that he didn't have *"enough points for a real career"* (CT, John,

Questionnaire, September 2006). John felt that he has forgotten much of what he had learned during teacher training: *"If you asked any teacher in the country let's say what they learned in College. You know a lot of it is forgotten"* (CT, John, Interview 1, October 9th 2006).

According to John high quality PE teaching is *"a mixture of movement, co-operation, fun and competency in a range of duties"* (CT, John, Questionnaire, September 2006). In addition, John commented that an effective PE teacher is *"competent in subject matter and a wide range of techniques/strategies to teach"* (CT, John, Questionnaire, September 2006) whereas an ineffective PE teacher would *"stick rigidly to programmes/schemes"*. In other words the ability *"to adapt to the pupils"* is important (CT, John, Questionnaire, September 2006).

John had experience of being mentored on TP and found that, on the whole, his CTs had supported his learning and were *"good role models, competent and accessible. Easy to talk to, always made time"* (CT, John, Questionnaire, September 2006). John recalled that they *"let me do my own thing. They were very good, coming in afterwards giving me advice"* (CT, John, Interview 1, October 9th 2006). He described this as neither a particularly close nor a distant supervision arrangement as *"they weren't all over me but they weren't, you know some people say take my classes and they'd be down town doing their shopping. They were always there"* (CT, John, Interview 1, October 9th 2006). Essentially, John felt confident that help was on hand if required:

> *They were very good if anything, even the smallest problem, be it equipment or if there was a difficult kid. They'd be straight in to you to give you the technique to work it but they wouldn't sort out your problem for you. They'd go away again* (CT, John, Interview 1, October 9th 2006).

John felt that this approach was very important so that the PETE student was vested with a degree of authority, thus not being so obvious as a PETE student to the pupils:

> *I think it's important, if I was in the lesson, or if they sit in the lesson, the kid automatically spots the teacher there and they know this lad [PETE student] is not be trusted here or is this lad not able for it* (CT, John, Interview 1, October 9th 2006).

He thought that the optimum approach for a PETE student was to *"go in on*

the first day on your own, the kids will go 'oh this is a new teacher' " (CT, John, Interview 1, October 9th 2006).

John was not aware of any school where the *"teacher [CT] would be stuck in a lesson with them [a PETE student]"* (CT, John, Interview 1, October 9th 2006). When discussing how TP is structured in the United Kingdom (UK), he was surprised that the CT remained in the room with the PETE student for much of the time, but commented: *"they are paid for it. So they are in there and they have to critique. It's a different system"* (CT, John, Interview 1, October 9th 2006). John believed that this *"would be a better system"* than the Irish system (Interview 1, October 9th 2006). He added: *"I think once you are paying somebody, you are bound to them"* (CT, John, Interview 1, October 9th 2006). If the role of the CT were to be formalised in Ireland, John would support a system which was a hybrid of the UK and Irish system:

> *I would have no problem sitting in and maybe if there was a.... at the moment you are not in the lesson. So if it was half and half that you appeared for 2, 3 or 4 lessons over 10 weeks and they had some sort of fairly loose questionnaire* (CT, John, Interview 1, October 9th 2006).

In terms of key mentoring skills, John listed *"communication skills and trouble shooting"* (CT, John, Questionnaire, September 2006). In relation to the current system of supervision in schools, John thought that the CT had *"difficulty being either in or out a lesson"* (CT, John, Questionnaire, September 2006). He also said that if the CT was constantly observing the lesson *"pupils pick up on pressure of co-op teacher [PETE student]"* (CT, John, Questionnaire, September 2006). He was certainly frustrated because there was very little *"time for feedback"* (CT, John, Questionnaire, September 2006). In spite of the work done by CTs, John was critical of the current system of TP assessment because CTs exert *"very little real influence"* (CT, John, Questionnaire, September 2006). Nonetheless, he did not feel that CTs needed to have any specific training to mentor PETE students:

> *I think we are professionals; we would be able to assess a lesson besides having someone tell you how to assess a lesson. You know it's not rocket science* (CT, John, Interview 1, October 9th 2006).

John was delighted to have PETE students in the school for TP, as he saw

them as a help to him:

> *We have got a fourth year every year and we generally get second years after Christmas from March they come out. They are good to have around. They do take the pressure off you* (CT, John, Interview 1, October 9th 2006).

Although, he did not feel that he needed further training in mentoring skills, John did think it would be useful if the Greendale University acknowledged the work of CTs by offering training in the teaching of specific activities in order to update PCK:

> *Would they be able to do workshops with you and someone bring you into Greendale University for a day and do some activity that would benefit you say I end up lots of times on the Internet looking for drills and games and activities. Whereas, if they said look here's 20 ways that you could do a warm up for basketball* (CT, John, Interview 1, October 9th 2006).

John also had another suggestion whereby the University would *"give you an allowance on equipment or something"* (CT, John, Interview 1, October 9th 2006). He gave an example of a sports organisation that had rewarded coaches:

> *Or even if they could give you a rain jacket or something. The GAA did that 5 years ago, they sent rain jackets, track suits, about 250 [euros] worth of gear, they sent out to everyone that was involved in GAA as a coach* (CT, John, Interview 1, October 9th 2006).

John was aware that *"there is a letter sent to the Principal but I [have] never seen the letter"* and thought the University should show their gratitude for his work as a CT, formally, by sending him a *"thank you letter"*. John commented that he had not been thanked for his work by the university for the past five years. (CT, John, Questionnaire, September 2006)

(c) Claire (UT)

Claire had been a PE teacher, a PE teacher educator and a researcher in PE teacher education and supervision for the past 30 years outside Ireland. This level of experience led Claire to describe herself as:

> *Relatively comfortable that I know what I am doing, and what I should be attempting to do as a teacher educator and supervisor* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

In relation to understanding the Irish teacher education context, Claire reported that she was on a:

> *Steep learning curve relative to contemporary Irish schools and the facilities and the actual perspectives of Principals to the co-operating teacher and to my student teacher* (UT, Claire,Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

Claire enjoyed grappling with this new context saying that this *was "one of the things that's really, really beneficial"* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 2007).

Claire described how she also enjoyed developing a relationship with CTs; a relationship in which she *"treats them as colleagues"* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007). She did acknowledge that this relationship-building was at an early stage, but she enjoyed *"meeting them and learning about what they are attempting to do"* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007). Claire felt that she did learn a little from CTs, and she relished *"opening up opportunities for them, from a professional point of view"* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007). When pressed on this issue, Claire explained that a relationship with one CT was *"as close as she would like it to be"* where she was able to probe *"the cooperating teacher to talk about what she saw"* and this *"gave her a sense of how she was reading the context"* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007). In addition, Claire commented:

> *Their [CTs] ability to observe and critique is not at all what I would like it to be. It's all about do they manage the....I mean were the kids not killing themselves and did they get safely to the...to the outside pitch, and that they are wonderful and they are nice with the kids, and so the sophistication of the ....of the critique. I mean ...and that is not a criticism of them, because they have never [been] trained...there is no relationship between being a good teacher and being able to critique a teaching student* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

In response to this perceived lack of training for the role of CT, Claire designed a *"little sort of handout for them so that they could actually use it to provide feedback, so as to guide their feedback"* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

In relation to UT support of PETE student learning, Claire felt it was important to encourage autonomy in the PETE student. Claire wanted to see them:

> *Making their own identity or remit as a teacher and not following particular rules or routes that we think they want you to go...I think the most rewarding is, that people*

(PETE students) can actually make a case for the way that they actually are teaching (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

When probed on the issue of assessment of PETE student learning in TP, Claire conveyed frustration in the system:

So that the notion that I can actually make a grade for my student that I saw once in an official visit for the whole semester is sort of ...absolutely totally frustrating. The fact that I am going to see them a whopping twice in semester two is frustrating. And so the system ...the...the credibility that I have in my own grade is very questionable. If any lawyer wanted to take me apart they could literally take me apart at the moment (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

(d) Mr. Cotter (SP)

Mr. Cotter commented that he liked the *"notion of the school playing its part in professional development or in the formation of the teachers of the future"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007). He thought that there was a:

Definite advantage to having PETE students - for all the teachers in school not just the CTs; for teachers who have been in the job for a long time to see new faces around the place and to see new ways of doing things (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

Furthermore, he felt that the established teachers became invigorated by *"the conversations that take place between the existing teachers of the school and new teachers coming along"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007). Mr. Cotter also felt that the students of Greendale University have been of a high calibre and he noted that he had *"always been impressed by the standard of student coming in from there"* because he found them to be *"very, very serious, very, very hardworking"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

Mr. Cotter expressed some concern that TP seemed to dampen PETE students' eagerness to experience teaching in reality:

One thing that kind of disturbs me a small bit is that from time to time when I do some work in Greendale University, as I do from time to time, I hear that quite often the students go out on teaching practice full of enthusiasm and so forth, and return somewhat disillusioned (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

He tried to explain this phenomenon by saying that perhaps *"reality is so different from you know the theory and in terms of pedagogy and so forth"*

(SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007). Moreover, he was critical of some aspects of the university course content in preparing PETE students:

> *Feedback and self awareness...self...self awareness I think is probably the biggest missing ingredient in all teaching training* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

In Mr. Cotter's opinion, it is difficult for school management teams to engage with PETE students as:

> *School management are just so blooming busy they have hardly the time to say: How are you? How are you getting on? How is it going for you? Can I do anything to help you? What are you finding difficult? And so on.*(SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

When he spoke of the relationship of the school and Greendale University, Mr. Cotter reported that the school felt undervalued in the process:

> *That actually we...we have accommodated a huge number of students from Greendale University over the years and there is a lot of work in it for the principal. Because first of all, you know, you have to deal with Barry Casey (Head of Placement in Greendale), then you have to meet the student and find out the subjects etc. etc. And then you have to go and meet the teachers, and you have to negotiate with them try to identify the classes that would be least problematic and co-ordinate all of that. So there is actually a huge amount of work. It isn't acknowledged. It is just expected, it is. And I do think that there should be some acknowledgement of the work that the Principal puts in* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

In essence, Mr. Cotter felt that the school was delivering the TP placement free of charge to the university and:

> *You see money speaks all languages to some extent. I don't want to sound mercenary, but money speaks all languages. And money is a way of indicating that you value something* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

Mr. Cotter advocated for Universities to pay schools to coordinate and mentor PETE students instead of the current arrangement, about which he felt increasingly unhappy:

> *Well...well I ...I actually...you see, I suppose, none of us like to be taken for granted, either as individuals or institutions. And there is a question of money for value and value for money. And if...if there was some remuneration it would also perhaps enable much more ...how would I say...a much more formal and worked out contract.* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007)

In essence, Mr. Cotter wanted an arrangement between the university and the

school where there was *"a bit of give and take"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

With regard to mentoring, Mr. Cotter recognised that CTs were pivotal in the support of PETE student learning but he felt that in *"becoming mentors, in a more formal sense, they would require considerable training, because their potential is considerable"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007). When probed on the mentoring task Mr. Cotter espoused the belief that supporting the PETE student to learn how to become an effective teacher was a very complex task. For him, the mentor must acknowledge that *"teaching is at least as much about heart as it is about the head"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007). More than this, Mr. Cotter believed that the *"actual persona of the teacher is actually ...it's ...it's actually part of the pedagogy you know"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007). This belief underpinned Mr. Cotter's critique of teacher training, where *"so little attention is given to the rounded formation of the teacher because the teacher is first and foremost a human being"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007). Mr. Cotter used the following metaphor to highlight this:

> *And it is rather like a car and a chassis...if the chassis isn't good, solid and...and so forth...Inadequate, no matter how much petrol you put into the car or no matter how good the engine is, it's no good* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

He felt that the role of the mentor was a crucial one and that they must be:

> *Right for this job, and also bearing in mind the enormity of the responsibility of a teacher, that a teacher is modelling all the time what it is to be a human being and so forth, and what it is to be a person in the world* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

When a CT assigns *"some classes to a student teacher, he or she cannot abdicate his or her responsibility [to that student teacher]"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007). In other words, the CT should mentor the student teacher throughout TP.

Mr. Cotter's views on the difficulties experienced by CTs in supporting PETE student learning centred on the fact that PETE students:

> *Tend to do small bits of work extremely well and in extreme detail, but perhaps don't move on, leaving the CT with a lot of work to be done in a short space of time* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

He thought that this was because PETE students *"do not see the full picture"* of schooling (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007). In order to support PETE students effectively, Mr. Cotter felt that CTs should:

> *Please keep in touch regularly every week with her or him [student teachers] just to see how they are getting on, are they having difficulties? and what can you do to help?* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

Mr. Cotter certainly felt that CTs should be part of the TP assessment process *"As...as just one element of the whole thing, not ...not the grader, but ...but just as an element of it"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007). He thought that if this was the case: *"it would be kind of recognising their role too, as seasoned professionals"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007). Mr. Cotter noted that Principals were asked to comment on PETE student behaviour but were not part of the grading process: *"Well we do get a form to fill out after the teaching practice [unclear] kind of...I think it's just a proforma thing. But it is not part of the grading process"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007). Mr. Cotter was vehement that School Principals should formally comment on PETE student learning on TP as he:

> *Would not mind having a say in what is happening, I...I do...and I mean I am at the stage that I am at now in my career and I do...I do feel strongly about that* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

Mr. Cotter also had some comments to make about the range of Tutors coming into the school to assess PETE student learning. He noted that the

> *Range and the diversity was just enormous [and he recommended that] tutors need a hell of a lot of training, and opportunities for reflection. And also learning how to give feedback, because giving feedback is an extremely difficult thing to do* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

Mr. Cotter added that a Tutor needed to be *"a very well developed person"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

The Relationships between Key Participants in the Tetrad.

(a) The relationship between Barbara (PETE student) and John (CT)

From Barbara's perspective:

Barbara didn't find the first three weeks of observation of school life beneficial because *"there was nothing she could watch"* (PETE student, Barbara, Interview 1, October 9th 2006). Barbara was adamant that she *"just wants ideas"* from John (CT). She did not want him to observe the class. When pressed on this, Barbara said:

> *Not that I don't want anyone there, but there is more pressure with everyone watching you, otherwise I might dread Monday* (PETE student, Barbara,Interview 1, October 9th 2006).

Barbara found that, at times, John was unable to look at the lesson plan in advance of the lesson or give her feedback at the end of a lesson and that *"it depended on how busy he is"* (PETE student, Barbara, Interview 2, November 13th 2006). Overall, Barbara felt that she actually *"got on better with Laura"*, the other CT, as John was:

> *Very shy and very hard to talk to sometimes...is not the easiest person to talk to. Whereas I would go to Laura first now, before I go to John. She is just...she is really nice and bubbly and very helpful and would go out of her way to help you and everything. Do you know, she is just....very easy to talk to as well* (PETE student, Barbara, Interview 3, February 12th 2007).

It would appear from Barbara's perspective that support from her CT was somewhat limited.

From John's perspective:

John did not see himself as a particularly good role model for Barbara or for any student teacher:

> *Oh now I wouldn't think I am good at all. I don't know am I good or bad? I never...I never thought of myself as much of a role model* (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007).

As a teacher, John shared his teaching philosophy with Barbara. Ultimately, he wanted to get to know his pupils as individuals:

> *But I try to...I try to get on with the kids try to...try to work out what is happening behind each one, you know what I mean, rather than just...you know, it's very easy just to treat them all as the same, you know what I mean* (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007).

He saw this as an important part of being a teacher and so it was also an important part of PETE student learning (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007)

John was taken aback when he realised that Barbara, in spite of having completed a five-year degree, had no teaching experience:

> *This is the first Grad Dip and Grad Dip is funny because they are all a bit more mature yet they have a zero teaching practice whereas the second years are well drilled in first year inside in Greendale University in the Micro teaching and all of that. They are teaching their peers* (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007).

It would appear that because Barbara was a mature PETE student, John expected that she would be more experienced: *"So I think we maybe expected almost too much from Barbara"* (CT, John, Interview 1, October 9th 2007):

> *Barbara did also give the impression that she knew more about teaching than she actually did and she also took it on herself as she seemed fully confident in the first term* (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007).

Initially, on TP, John noted that Barbara's class timing was incorrect and she tried to do four soccer skills in one lesson. However as TP progressed, John felt that because of Barbara's range of expertise *"she would be more competent with our fourth year girls than a [four-year] Greendale University person"* (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007). John also discovered that Barbara's knowledge of games and rules *"would probably be nearly as...more...probably above mine"* (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007). In summary, it would appear that John was rather uncomfortable in his role as CT and this limited the effectiveness of his role as mentor.

(b) The relationship between Barbara (PETE student) and Claire (UT)

In this section, a post lesson conference is described between Claire (UT), Laura (the other CT) and Barbara (PETE student). It demonstrated the nature of the relationship between Barbara, Laura and Claire.

Directly after the lesson Barbara commented that she felt that the *"lesson didn't go too great like but...it wasn't too bad"* (PETE student, Barbara, Focus Group Interview, March 29th 2007). Claire interrogated Laura after the lesson to establish if the lesson was of Barbara's normal standard:

Like she grilled Laura because she wanted...and because the class were really well behaved and she wanted to know how I dealt with behaviour problems (PETE student Focus Group Interview, March 29th 2007).

Sensing that Claire was unsure of Barbara's performance, Laura vehemently defended Barbara's teaching:

Laura just goes, well to be honest I would be disgusted and...and very upset if Barbara doesn't get a really good mark here and all this (PETE student, Barbara, Focus Group Interview, March 29th 2007).

Because Laura had shielded her from Claire's comments, Barbara thought that her CTs were *"brilliant...like do you know? They wouldn't put you down though. So like they were brilliant...like do you know"* (PETE student, Barbara, Focus Group Interview, March 29th 2007). It appeared as if the PETE student and CT were on one side and the University Tutor was on the other.

(c) The relationship between Barbara (PETE student) and Mr. Cotter (SP)

Barbara was very impressed that the school had an Induction Programme for new teachers:

There...there was a teacher in...in Byron's Way, and she came up to us the first day, and she was...her job like was she was an English and French teacher, but she was also a liaison officer with the...the student teachers. And she came up and sat down with us and said, if you ever...if you have any problems or you need to talk or anything like that, just come look for me and I will... (PETE student, Barbara, Focus Group Interview, March 29th 2007)

Mr. Cotter (SP) explained that the School Induction Coordinator did not meet "*formally*" with new teachers *"but there was a person to turn to for advice and help in the school"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th, 2007).

Generally, Mr. Cotter was confident that PETE students enjoyed their time at Byron's Way Secondary School. Mr. Cotter reported that he always received positive feedback from the PETE students at Byron's Way Secondary School:

When student teachers are leaving here, they are...Always seem to be absolutely thrilled and saying that they were just so lucky to have come now [but] I might be looking through rose-coloured glasses (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

(d) The relationship between John (CT) and Claire (UT)

John commented that he had never been invited by a UT to give a detailed

critique on Barbara's progress on TP. He also found it frustrating that the UT never has time to talk to him or the PETE student *"like the inspector [university tutor] comes here like you are...saying I have to be in Riverdale"* (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007). He had been asked:

> *Well how is she getting on? That was the question. You know, the answer, the stock answer was 'very well', you know what I mean? But, nothing, like, as detailed as to actually, sit down and talk one on one* (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007).

When asked whether he would like to be involved in the critique of the PETE student learning John replied firmly: *"I think I should be, yes"* (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007). John certainly believed that he would be honest and forthright to a UT about Barbara's progress and would be professional about giving feedback. He was clear that he would not defend the PETE student position if she did not warrant it because he felt that:

> *If you are meant to be a professional [unclear] you can't side with somebody if you didn't think she was doing...you know, her job* (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007).

John reported that previously, he had been a CT to PETE students who were not performing well:

> *But then there would be one or two maybe that you know you wouldn't feel their style was right or their attitude was right or dress sense was right...*(CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007).

In this instance he *"would have to pull them up on it, you know what I mean"* (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007). John would share this with the UT if necessary, however, he also admitted that because he was not sitting in on classes with Barbara:

> *Again I...I can only comment on things I am picking up...rather than observing lessons. So I would be lying if I said, oh she is a great teacher now she is doing this that and the other perfect* (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007).

In the early days, John observed that Barbara did find teaching very difficult:

> *And like the first week she was coming out flustered and it wouldn't be far off a tear like. And you would see that she would have to go for a smoke* (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007).

A number of months on, he has *"picked up, passing through the hall"* that Barbara *"is a bit more realistic"* (CT,John, Interview 3 February 12th 2007). He added an example where he:

> *Came from upstairs, so she is starting to get her class organised. So she has them in lines, you know what I mean? She has their attention* (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007).

He could not honestly comment on her ability as a teacher i.e. he could not say: *"she is becoming a brilliant teacher because I am not in there looking at her"* (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007).

John was unhappy because, from his perspective, the CT role remained largely undefined within TP:

> *I think our only sort of guidelines is that you know we would remain in the school and be available should a problem arise. I mean so we always...you are never too far away* (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007).

Instead, however, John wanted to see a scenario where:

> *Maybe there should be something more formal where Barbara knows that on third class Tuesday we are...Laura and myself or Laura or me are going in* (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007).

(e) The relationship between John (CT) and Mr. Cotter (Principal)

Mr. Cotter was very proud of his staff in terms of how they supported PETE students and new teachers. He commented that generally, they were:

> *Very helpful and a very welcoming place, not stiff and starchy, but friendly and supportive... very approachable and very helpful. That's what I keep hearing anyway* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

This comment applies to Mr. Cotter's perception of how John liaises with Barbara on TP.

Summary

Barbara was reluctant to allow John (CT) to observe her classes as she felt under pressure with *"everyone watching you"* (PETE student, Barbara, Interview 1, October, 9th 2006). John, for the most part had no time to view Barbara's lesson plan in advance of the lesson or to give post lesson feedback. Barbara found John difficult to liaise with and tended to have a better relationship with the other CT, Laura. Overall, it would appear that, from Barbara's perspective, support for learning from the CT was somewhat limited. Furthermore, Barbara viewed the UT as the assessor rather than as a supporter of her learning.

John, in the absence of a defined CT role, emulated the CTs he had experienced as a student on TP and left Barbara *"do her own thing"* (CT, John, Questionnaire, September 2006) commenting that he did not want to crowd Barbara. John did not think that he should not be in the class constantly as the PETE student should be vested with an air of authority. He commented that CTs had no role in the assessment of PETE students and had *"very little influence on the TP grade"* (CT, John, Questionnaire, September 2006). He also grumbled that Tutors had no time to engage with him, and, in the past four years, the University had never thanked him for his involvement as a CT (CT, John, Questionnaire, September 2006). John was vehement that CTs did not need to be trained as mentors.

Claire (UT) viewed the CTs as "*colleagues*" (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007). Claire was unhappy with the level of critiquing ability displayed by the CTs, and deemed it to be very superficial. Claire tried to address this by creating *"a little sort of handout for them"* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007). Claire described the role of the Tutor as encouraging the PETE student to become an *"autonomous teacher"* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007). Claire was frustrated that she was expected to grade TP based on a few short observations of PETE student performance (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

Mr. Cotter (SP) clearly believed that the school played *"its part in professional development or in the formation of the teachers of the future"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2006). Mr. Cotter was disappointed that the role of his school was undervalued by the University. In addition, Mr. Cotter had never been asked to give feedback on PETE students' development on TP (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2006).

Chapter Nine: Case Study Three - Carol

Introduction

In this chapter, a vignette of Case Study Three is outlined. This case study centres on PETE student, Carol, and three other participants: Michael, the cooperating teacher (CT), Claire, the Greendale University Tutor (UT) and Mr. O'Brien, the Deputy Principal (DP) of TreeTops School. The vignette is divided into two key areas:

1. Biography and views of participants on the TP process.
2. The relationships between key participants in the tetrad.

Biography and Views of Participants on the TP Process.

(a) Carol (PETE Student)

Carol *"always had an interest in becoming a PE teacher...thought it was an easy job"* (PETE student, Carol, Questionnaire September 2006). Carol was a graduate of Brightwater University having spent five years there obtaining her B.Sc. in Health, Fitness and Leisure Studies. In order to become a qualified PE teacher, she applied for and was granted a place on the Grad Dip programme. Carol wanted to be a teacher who *"wants to nurture and care for students"* (PETE student, Carol, Questionnaire, September 2006). Carol felt that mentoring was important and she would like to have this support during TP: *"It would be good to have a mentor in order to ask questions that you're unsure about"* (PETE student, Carol, Questionnaire, September 2006).

(b) Michael (CT)

Michael had been teaching PE for three years and had PETE students under his supervision since he began teaching. He felt that an ineffective PE teacher was:

> *Someone who just throws in ball all the time...Someone who produces 5 brilliant basket-ballers and 20 people who hate it* (CT, Michael, Interview 1, November 20th 2006).

Michael expanded on this comment believing that the PE teacher needed to encourage life long physical activity in the limited PE class time available:

> *Because they are not going to get fit and they are not going to get healthy in the 40 or 50 minutes we have them during the week. So if they kind of enjoy it and they kind of*

learn a little...in that like they have some basic skills. So when they are outside like, when then it comes to...when they are 18...19 or...even in the evenings, that they can do...like or they can participate in some sport reasonably competently like. I don't want them to be brilliant. Like that's not the aim in my classes (CT, Michael, Interview 1 November 20th 2006).

However, Michael believed that the pathway toward this goal was often thwarted by the *"perception of PE in schools...lack of facilities and lack of time"* (CT, Michael, Interview 1, November 20th 2006).

When Michael described mentors who have influenced his teaching, he was able to portray one particular person who was very influential: *"He taught me a lot in terms of handling a class especially, but also in teaching points and hints in technique"* (CT, Michael, Interview 1, November 20th 2006). In addition, this person appeared to possess the key mentoring skills of *"communication, approachability and organisation"* (CT, Michael, Questionnaire, September 2006). As a CT, Michael believed his duties included the following: *"Watch classes and write out tips. Go through lesson plans and give suggestions"* (CT, Michael, Questionnaire, September 2006). Michael also contended that the CT was *"someone who pointed them [PETE students] in the right direction"* (CT, Michael, Questionnaire, September 2006). Michael identified both positive and negative aspects of supporting PETE student learning during TP. Among the benefits to supervising PETE students, Michael said *"you can learn from pupils (sic), which improves your classes, can be enjoyable"* (CT, Michael, Interview 1, November 20th 2006). He also identified a number of difficulties with supporting PETE student learning on TP as it *"can create work, sometimes pupils learn bad habits which have to be corrected afterwards"* (CT, Michael, Interview 1, November 20th 2006). When asked to comment on the role of the UT in assessment of PETE students, he said that they are *"reasonably effective [but] lack consistency or complete insight into how student teacher is doing as a teacher"* (CT, Michael, Interview 1, November 20th 2006).

(c) Claire (UT)

Claire was a UT to Barbara, Carol and Edel. An account of Claire's expertise and views on teacher education can be found in Barbara's vignette in Chapter Eight.

(d) Mr. O'Brien (Deputy Principal)

Mr. O'Brien had been a Deputy Principal at TreeTops Community School for the past 15 years. He described many benefits to having PETE students in the school on TP every year. Firstly, he portrayed how school management *"keeps a track of any new trends and so on that are going on"* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007). From the point of view of the teachers, Mr. O'Brien also identified an advantage in that *"we feel it's kind of a learning process for the teachers"* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007). In addition, Mr. O'Brien said that because the school has regular contact with the university the teachers actively engaged in continuing professional development (CPD) at a higher level:

> *They actually have a contact with...with the university. Like this year alone we have seven people doing Masters and we have actually one doing a second degree* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. O'Brien illustrated how he was encouraged by a UT from Greendale University whom he views as his mentor, to undertake further study:

> *I suppose the fact that Paul O'Reilly was coming through the place would have been probably one of the reasons myself...that I have actually done my own masters. Because he would have encouraged me and said look, you are doing all this work, why don't you actually write it up. And I think that would have happened certainly in about four of those seven people doing masters this year* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

In addition, Mr. O'Brien sensed that having a close relationship with the university also allowed the school to become aware of current educational research and to put such research findings into action. This remedied the fact that:

> *Our own professional body (teaching) there's very, very, very little research that comes through...educational research and so on. It certainly doesn't get discussed. It is just people moaning and groaning, by and large, of difficulties that are happening, and is often dysfunctional* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

Leading on from this, Mr. O'Brien said that TreeTops Community School was currently used as a research site by the university: *"the school would actually have a research project linked with Greendale University through teaching practice".* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

So this school was generating data for university research projects.

In Mr. O'Brien's view, the university had another key function for the school because it also acted as a guide or advisor when key educational legislation came into force:

> *We would also use I suppose the fact that we would have people coming through and so on. Like when the Education Act came out you know we were looking for advice and so on and we would have actually used someone from the university to come out and talk to the staff* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. O'Brien felt undervalued in the TP process currently and said that *"we need something back I feel"* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007) in addition to the CPD and research opportunities being offered.

When asked about the role of the CT in supporting PETE student learning on TP, Mr. O'Brien said that they needed to have experience of both teaching and management of the school:

> *I ...I honestly think they should have at least 15...20 years teaching experience. And I honestly think it's not enough for a mentor to be just a teacher. I think they should have some experience of management and should be willing to be in management* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

In addition to this, in Mr. O'Brien's opinion, mentor teachers should be well versed in the pastoral care of pupils:

> *Mentor teachers should be informed in the pastoral care of students? Because I feel that is key. You know, I think every teacher should be accountable. Humphries [academic] said that and I believe it. Because it is not enough to say, Johnny is crying inside in my class, but I am here to teach English and Johnny is crying, not good enough to say it doesn't really matter about Johnny...he needs to be picked up. And I think the teacher should be...the mentors should have counselling skills* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. O'Brien depicted a mentor as an experienced teacher who was *"able to relate to the student (pupils) on...on a personal basis and an intellectual basis"* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007). Adding to this, he felt that a mentor *"should always have a contact with teaching... no point being able to talk the talk, you must be able to walk the talk"* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007). In

other words, they must be <u>able</u> to teach, not just talk <u>about</u> teaching.

In terms of the role of CT as mentor, Mr. O'Brien said that both the CT and the UT should jointly assess the PETE student learning on TP:

> *Well I certainly think he should have a serious advisory role with the student and like certainly he should also actually have a role in the assessment of the student together with the tutor who watches them* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

In addition, he believed that the SP and the DP should contribute to the assessment of PETE students. Currently, because the role of school management in TP was undefined, Mr. O'Brien "*would only see what is happening in the corridor*" (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007). He did, however, go out of his way to ask CTs for feedback on PETE student progress:

> *The teachers [CTs] would be very open and say, look, jeepers this student [teacher] isn't hacking it* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. O'Brien contended that this trilateral system of assessment (CT, UT and SP) would improve the current quality of the TP grading in place. He intimated that some PETE students pass TP and are not perhaps capable of teaching. In his opinion, it was imperative that TP grading was robust to reassure SPs of the quality of PETE graduates:

> *If we [schools] can't employ them when they come out [of TP] there is a problem with their qualifying [on TP] and by saying that they [PETE students] are good enough to go out teaching* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

The Relationships between Key Participants in the Tetrad.

(a) The relationship between Carol (PETE student) and Michael (CT)

<u>From Carol's perspective:</u>

It was clear that Carol (PETE student) and Michael (CT) did not jointly plan the lessons. Carol offered to "*do a plan and then we try it*" (PETE student, Carol, Interview 1, November 20th 2006). Michael refused to do this and mentioned how busy he was: "*You see it's a bit awkward, post grad is just Monday and I'm on for the rest of the day...*" (CT, Michael, Interview 1, November 20th 2006). So, Michael suggested to Carol "*maybe for the next three classes you do it and then and after school we talk about it for ten*

minutes" (CT, Michael, Interview 1, November 20th 2006). This indicated that Michael did not have the time to help Carol prepare for her classes. In the second phase of TP, Carol became very frustrated with this lack of help from Michael and began to worry about how she would control the class. She seemed frightened and intimidated by pupils, fearing that they would be *"malicious...that they totally don't listen...and don't do anything you want them to do..."* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 1, November 20th 2006). By the final phase of TP, this lack of pre-lesson help from Michael was still evident, when Carol said:

> *I do my own lesson plans. He doesn't even see my lesson plans. He doesn't even know what I am actually putting into it. I don't think he thinks I have planned at all* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

When Michael did give Carol feedback, it was always given after the lesson and Carol perceived it as always negative, so she was starting to feel disillusioned:

> *I didn't feel he was giving me positive feedback at all...he'd give me all stuff like this went wrong, that went wrong. I just took it all as negative but he was only trying to help me. He'd never actually say 'this is good but do this'. He is constantly saying to me 'don't do that, don't do that, do this'* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

Because of Michael's constant litany of negativity, Carol said *"I just don't think he thinks I'm competent enough"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). The situation finally came to a head when Carol confronted Michael on the issue: *"I was trying to make it as positive as I could. He really is helpful. I said you really are helpful but you could be more positive"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). Michael was very defensive and retorted that:

> *He feels, which I kind of knew he felt that Brightwater students don't have enough background in the area whereas Greendale University students get six week blocks of badminton and they used to get assessed on badminton whereas we only have little bits here and there and we really are mainly an invasion as well...he didn't really think this post grad was working because I think, in general, Greendale University students feel they have a lot more knowledge than us* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

Michael immediately wanted to hand Carol over to the other PE teacher *"do you want to go with Martha then, do you want to go with the other teacher?"* and *"he wouldn't look me in the eye either"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2,

December 4th 2006). Carol, then, asked him if he perceived that she was responsible for her lack of competence:

> *Do you think I am really unmotivated I said to him and he just didn't answer and I said do you? And he said, ya, more or less. But I am. I am unmotivated* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

Carol knew that Michael was right. She was struggling because she didn't have the PCK needed to teach PE and Greendale University did not seem to be aware of this problem:

> *But the problem is Greendale think we have all this stuff because we have done little courses on bits of things. We don't have proper i.e. athletics. I don't have a clue. I have to go look it all up myself. Dance, only that I am kind of good at dance myself. Only then I am able to do it. Only the invasion [games] is all we have* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

For Carol, the reality was that in Brightwater University *"we did a week of dance, a week of outdoor, a week of athletics. You pay 50, 60 euro to do each module"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). She admitted that the only reason that the courses were done was *"so that we could apply for Greendale University"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). Carol saw the main difficulty with these short courses being: *"the lesson plan and stuff weren't properly set out so you just put the lesson plan together"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). Carol added that through these short courses: *"yes, you were supposed to be able to teach, but I don't know how you learn to teach in two days"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

In addition, Carol was failing to receive the mentoring she wanted to receive to supplement her lack of PCK. When asked how the relationship was with Michael now, she said "*Grand, it's kind of like that I don't really exist*" (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). This was not completely true as Michael still offered some learning support. However, Michael still did not review Carol's lesson plans prior to the lessons:

> *He doesn't even see my lesson plans. He doesn't even know what I am actually putting into it. I don't think he thinks I have planned at all. He thought I just go in there...I do have lesson plans but they are not very detailed* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

Michael continued to give post lesson feedback: *"he was very good to watch and taking in everything to showing me [Carol] how to improve my practice"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

Carol continued to feel unsupported in her learning throughout TP, and felt unsure about her choice of career: *"I don't know whether I want to be a PE teacher. This is the problem"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). Carol had to force herself to remain on TP: *"I have to tell myself that it is ok. When I am in there, I am fine"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). She described how she *"can't sleep at night and getting chest pains, anxiousness and before I come in"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). Carol felt stressed because she felt that she *"was really trying to prove myself to him"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). Suddenly, Carol began to realise that she could not continue to blame Michael for her teaching performance:

> *I thought the problem was Michael all along because he wasn't giving me help...but it was really myself. Myself as well. I wasn't confident doing the stuff and then he wasn't helping...I do think it might be me...my own insecurities, a bit* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

Carol described how she bolstered herself and then realised that perhaps putting more effort into her planning might help the situation. She seemed right in this assumption:

> *Even last night, I felt a bit better than usual and I said 'why am I not as bad as usual?'. Cause I planned so much better. I had it down to a tee when I was going around the class. The class did run well* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

In addition to this, Carol decided that she needed to change her attitude:

> *I just think, I have been so negative about it and I just have to start being positive about it. I am moaning the last four months about it and I just have to think to myself, I am in it now and give it your all* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

Furthermore, Carol endeavoured to tackle her lack of PCK by:

> *Challenging myself with regard to getting out books, getting to know the games better. Trying to think of ways to get motivated* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

Carol believed that being self-motivated was perhaps the only mechanism to survive TP: *"I think it's down to the individual"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006)

From Michael's perspective:

At the outset of TP, Michael decided that the focus should be on the development of Carol's classroom management skills:

> *I am not too worried about the quality at this stage, she's coming for a seven week block later on, classroom management comes first and everything else comes second cos you can't do anything without it... The first thing you have got to be able to do is to control the class* (CT, Michael, Interview 1, November 20th 2006).

However, even by the end of TP, Michael had noticed that Carol still did not have control of the class: "*watching her presence in class and it ain't there*" (CT, Michael, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). Carol's planning seemed to be inadequate and untidy and "*very disorganised. All of the stuff is on scraps of paper, dog-eared etc.*" (Researcher, Reflective Journal, December 4th 2006)

Overall, Michael said that he felt TP had been very difficult for Carol: "*Do you know...so I would say it has been kind of a bit of a rough ride for her really*" (CT, Michael, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). This was primarily due to Carol's lack of PCK in key areas. Often, Carol would say that she had a level zero, or basic coaching qualification in a particular area, but Michael thought that such a qualification was not sufficient for teaching:

> *And level zero...like I done level one...I done level zero, like [unclear] one and it goes as far as level two...just the GAA. And OK level zero was a complete and utter c**p...You would just turn up. And if you turned up everyone got it. And there was people there I wouldn't put in charge of a cat, not to mention like 20 young fellas* (CT, Michael, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

Carol agreed with him and said that through these courses "*you were supposed to be able to teach, but I don't know how you learn to teach in two days*" (PETE student, Carol, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). To supplement PCK, Michael knew that often Carol turned to books which, in his opinion was not as effective as being taught the skills in a formal setting:

> *She gets it from a book...and like reading it from a book and someone explaining it to you is completely different*...(CT, Michael, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

Michael did admit that, sometimes, Carol's book ideas did transfer well and "*her lessons...some of them are brilliant*" (CT, Michael, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). But, this was on a rare occasion and for the most part:

> *It [the idea] does not transfer well from book to classroom as you have got 24 students inside there like...it looks great in the book...and maybe no guidance on like the order you teach them in* (CT, Michael, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

He was surprised that the Grad Dip programme did not provide a strong PCK for PETE students. In contrast, Michael described how in the four year Greendale University degree programme, of which he had experience, *"we were shown [PCK]...we participated in doing it [PCK] that way"* (CT, Michael,Interview 3, February 16th 2007). Therefore, Michael felt very confident in his PCK on graduating from university. It was clear from this that Michael saw a definite need for Carol to improve her PCK in many areas. He thought that the pressure on Carol trying to supplement her PCK, by herself, must have made her feel that *"she was gone...fecking mental"* (CT, Michael, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). Interestingly, Michael did not see that his role as CT required him to help Carol improve her PCK. Instead, it was the role of the university.

When asked how his CT relationship with Carol had developed, Michael did not refer to the discussion Carol had with him in November but he admitted that he *"kind of felt maybe I was a bit overpowering her at the start"* (CT, Michael, Interview 3, February 16th 2007) and that now he tended to question her more:

> *And it's more questions than would...would you...what would you think about doing this or what would you...you know rather than...Like could this be done better or...* (CT, Michael, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

However, by the end of TP, Michael's support of Carol's learning had morphed into a more remote supervision:

> *Kind of more sitting in that little office. And I have been just doing my own thing and I will look up and I kind of would say...I might just leave three points now* (CT, Michael, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

(b) The relationship between Carol (PETE student) and Claire and Nigel (UTs)

Carol described how difficult she found TP and eventually spoke to her university tutors, Claire and Nigel, about it: *"I broke down last week in front of the two of them"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). Carol was disappointed with their response: *"They were kind of like, oh God. They didn't understand where it was all coming from"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). They encouraged her to *"have a chat with*

Michael about it...about the lack of positive feedback" (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). Carol was taken aback that Nigel thought that she could not accept criticism: *"He actually said he thinks I can't take feedback. I take it all too critical"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). In the end, she accepted this saying that sometimes she was *"paranoid"*. She was very unhappy that Nigel inferred that perhaps Michael was right, that she was not a good teacher:

> *One comment he made, I didn't like at all. He said ... I was really upset. I said look I know I'm good at it. I know I have the ability to do it. I just have to have the confidence in myself and he turned around and said well you are not necessarily good at it* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 1, December 4th 2006).

Carol thought that Nigel was being too blunt and insensitive and was just putting *"salt in the wound and I thought that was a bit harsh"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 1, December 4th 2006). Carol tried to look positively at Nigel's feedback, and said: *"but what he was trying to say was, you will be good, eventually. But that's the way it came out"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 1, December 4th 2006). During this exchange with the UTs, she found: *"Claire, very nice and Nigel, very approachable"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 1, December 4th 2006). Claire and Nigel's demeanour changed, however, when Carol showed resilience, *"I'm going to stick at it and will stick through it.* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 1, December 4th 2006) They both became annoyed, as they seemed to believe that PETE student teachers should see TP as a very positive experience, and said *"it's [TP] not supposed to be about 'sticking at it'"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 1, December 4th 2006).

Later that day, Carol began to 'squirm' and said that she found the whole conversation *"so embarrassing"* and that evening decided to email Claire saying *"look I'm sorry for crying my eyes out and I'm going to try harder"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 1, December 4th 2006). She was taken aback when she got a very clinical response to her emotional email:

> *The big e-mail back with quotes from Education and just felt like her saying it's ok...Just a big reel of 'education is this'. Teachers are there for...a big story about, like, trying to be a bit philosophical about it* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

At that point, Carol felt very low. She had hoped that Claire would have been

empathic and caring: *I would rather her say look its going to be okay like a mother, kind of, but she was very philosophical"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). Carol said that she was so taken aback by this cold response *"And I was a bit 'oh God' "* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). It seemed that Claire did not know how to comfort Carol and encourage her on TP. Equally, it seemed that Claire did not realise the reality of Carol's TP experience where Michael was rarely supporting Carol's learning, leaving her very much alone.

(c) The relationship beteen Carol (PETE student) and Mr. O'Brien (Deputy Principal)

Mr. O'Brien (Deputy Principal), when asked about Carol's learning progress on TP said:

> *One of the big things I would see, you know, just talking to her is, would I employ her? Regardless of how good she is in teaching practice and I would say I probably wouldn't because she has only one subject, SPHE* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

As explained in Aoife's vignette in Chapter Seven (see p.130), the Grad Dip students studied both PE and SPHE. As both PE and SPHE are non-examination subjects in Ireland, school principals may have preferred to employ a PE teacher who had an academic subject to offer. Furthermore Mr. O'Brien did not feel that SPHE teachers needed a specific qualification and that he *"would expect that most teachers could go in and talk SPHE. I know it is actually lived and...and taught."* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007). SPHE is Social Personal and Health Education and is a compulsory non-examination subject taught in Irish Secondary Schools. Subsequently, Mr. O'Brien said that employing a teacher is a very onerous task, it was important to get it right as: *"once you employ a teacher you really have that baby for the rest of your life"* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007). In looking for potential teachers, he watched student teachers to see:

> *If there is a presence, I am looking at the presence of them around the place. How do they interact with kids on the corridor, not just within class?* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

In addition he looked to see if they are "*involved in extra curricular activities*" (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007). Finally, Mr.

O'Brien expected that:

> *They should...like in some cases I find when there is something going on in the school, like parent teacher meetings, staff meetings they should be there* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. O'Brien wondered if these things were *"evaluated in teaching practice"* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007). It was something, he believed, should be considered to make the PETE student as employable as possible on graduation.

Carol felt very isolated in the school, and said that there was *"no induction programme for student teachers"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). She had not been invited to the Staff Christmas Party *"I wasn't invited but I wouldn't go"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). Carol described how no-one on the staff had time to talk to her:

> *I do just literally think everyone is so hustle and bustle and busy. They don't have time and they do think, oh a student – euh* (PETE student, Interview 3, December 4th 2006).

Carol described how she had almost become invisible and *"I kind of sneak off. Nobody even knows I exist...they don't even know my name"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2007).

When asked about her dealings with the Deputy Principal during TP Carol said: *"I just think your man [Deputy Principal] doesn't even know my name. He doesn't care about knowing my name"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). Carol thought that the only thing that concerned the Deputy Principal was his own reputation:

> *All he cares about is his reputation in the school. Because he even said to me 'will you tell me if a supervisor comes so that I do get the class to behave and stuff'? He only cares about his class behaving like* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

However, she may have misconstrued his query in the following example:

> *Last week, he asked me how I was getting on. I thought he was genuinely interested and I thought Ok. And then he said were they messing? I said no, no they were fine. All he cared about was, were they messing?* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

Mr. O'Brien was clearly trying to ensure that Carol did not have problems maintaining discipline. He was offering her support.

(d) The relationship between Michael (CT) and Claire (UT)

Michael used a post lesson observation form created by Claire (Tutor) to help guide his feedback. This was given to Michael at the outset of TP. There is no evidence to show how Claire engaged with Michael during the TP process.

(e) The relationship between Michael (CT) and Mr. O'Brien (Deputy Principal)

Mr. O'Brien identified that CTs are currently rudderless in the TP system and are unsure as to their role. Therefore he suggested that:

> *There should be guidelines given to them for...for what to do as the reality is that they need something to know what I am meant to do.* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. O'Brien also described how current university guidelines regarding PETE student supervision in the classroom are sketchy:

> *Like we have a policy in the school that the teachers have to stay in class at all times with the student...the teacher...or the student on teaching practice, not to interfere inside in the class, but for insurance background I think universities should put it in...into some kind of guidelines* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal February 16th 2007).

He also would like to see CTs, and School management more involved in the process of assessing PETE student learning on TP:

> *I think there should be form...I think that the year head...or the class tutor here in...or the year tutor...whatever we call it here in the school, should have a mechanism on maybe a weekly basis, a fortnightly basis or a monthly basis, whatever is practical, that they would do some kind of evaluation and some input on a weekly basis...so you can see progression* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. O'Brien felt that the involvement of school personnel in the TP assessment was on *"an informal basis at present"* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007). He saw school personnel and the university tutor as central in this process and therefore all parties *"need to know that model of assessment"* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007). Specifically, Mr. O'Brien felt that the CT needed to know the assessment criteria; he/she *"needs to know what you are looking for as well."* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal February 16th 2007). He advocated that *"the tutor and the teacher sit down in the evaluation of the*

student (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal February 16th 2007) More than that he wanted:

> *Some collaboration on a formal basis where year heads and perhaps myself, and the Principal as well, could give feedback through some formal process* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

(f) Claire (University Tutor) – Mr. O'Brien (Deputy Principal)

In spite of having a good relationship with the university, Mr. O'Brien was unhappy with the quality of UTs currently coming into the school, because they appeared to be so young and inexperienced:

> *Like if I see someone 25...26...27 years of age, I ask what experience have those got? And, just the fact that they might be doing a masters or PhD inside...does not give them the right to come in* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. O'Brien saw other worrying trends in that these inexperienced tutors were not really interested in supporting the PETE student learning on TP and he was very *"alarmed about their lack of interest in the student"* and wondered *"how they are screened before coming in here* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007). In relation to their expertise: *"I often think that they talk the talk, but I think the lack of walk the walk is worrying"* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007). From Mr. O'Brien's perspective, these UTs know how to talk about teaching but couldn't teach. Mr. O'Brien cited one example of an inexperienced tutor on TP:

> *I had a person here last year sat down and I asked them about LCA [Leaving Certificate Applied] course, asked them about research and so on. I asked them about what kind of grades was...would a student get...you know what were the...what were the grade brackets? Like I can tell you from an A1 to an F, what are the points, the grades, and so on. They couldn't tell me. They didn't know. They said that they were potential honours. I said, 'what grades do you get for a potential honours?' and they couldn't tell me. The second time they came in...they have totally avoided me, because they were afraid that I would ask them more questions* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. O'Brien says that this behaviour from inexperienced UTs was very different to the calibre of Senior Tutors from the University:

> *The senior people that we have known from my time in...in Greendale University, they would always spend a lot of time talking to us about what was going on in the school* (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007).

Summary

Carol had very limited PE PCK, a fact which was noted by Michael (CT). Carol perceived that the post lesson feedback given by Michael (CT) was largely negative and she became disillusioned on TP, developing insomnia and chest pains. During one visit from her UTs, Claire and Nigel, Carol became very upset and was advised to talk to Michael about the problems. Carol was surprised when Michael became defensive during their discussion. Thereafter, Michael's learning support diminished and he gave less feedback and avoided her company. Carol felt that her UTs lacked empathy when she was upset and she had hoped for a warmer response. She felt very isolated in the staffroom, and thought that most teachers didn't even know her name, including the Deputy Principal. Carol thought that this might be because there was such a volume of student teachers coming into the school and teachers became immune to them. Carol had been excluded from staff functions e.g. the Christmas party. In order to survive TP, Carol took charge of her own learning and looked to books and the Internet to inform her lesson planning. Soon her sleep pattern improved and she felt less stressed. Tellingly she said *"they have all the facilities, but I might be happier in a school that is more friendly and has one football"* (PETE student, Carol, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

Michael saw his role as a CT to give Carol post lesson learning support on classroom management issues only. In spite of identifying her lack of expertise in PCK, he did not support her learning of PCK and was aware that Carol gleaned this information from books. He did not mention the altercation between Carol and himself in November, but did say the type of learning support given by him had altered throughout TP and by the end of TP he had become even more removed from the process.

Claire (UT) was not empathetic with Carol, when Carol explained how difficult her relationship with Michael had become. Immediately, she suggested that Carol talk to Michael about his negative post lesson feedback. However, Claire did not explain how this might be done in an assertive manner. Ultimately, her advice to Carol regarding resolution of the issue had a detrimental effect on the relationship between Michael and Carol, resulting in

CT support diminishing, not increasing. Claire did not ask Carol about the consequences of her conversation with Michael.

Mr. O'Brien (DP) valued the strong relationship between his school and the university. He saw the school as a site for research and practicum and the university as an advisor and site of professional development for his teachers. He was unhappy with the calibre of younger UTs coming to school to monitor PETE student learning, but was very happy with the level of expertise and help given by the senior UTs. In terms of his philosophy of teaching, Mr. O'Brien said that teaching is more than just teaching in the classroom and when he looked for feedback on PETE student learning during TP, he wanted to see if the student teacher had a strong rapport with pupils inside and outside the classroom. Mr. O'Brien wanted a trilateral system of TP assessment involving consultation between CT, UT and school management (SP and DP).

Chapter Ten: Case Study Four - Dara

Introduction

In this chapter, a vignette of Case Study Four is outlined. This case study focuses on PETE student, Dara, and three other participants: Anita, the cooperating teacher (CT), Liz, the Greendale University Tutor (UT) and Mr. Clancy, the School Principal (SP) of Mountview Community School. The vignette is divided into two key areas:

1. Biography and views of participants on the TP process.
2. The relationships between key participants in the tetrad.

Biography and Views of Participants on the TP Process.

(a) Dara (PETE student)

Dara graduated from Brightwater University having studied a five-year B.Sc. in Health, Fitness and Leisure Studies. In order to gain her PE teaching qualification, Dara had gained a place on the Grad Dip programme. Dara appeared to have a wide range of experience working with young people. She had been a Sports Teacher in a Youth Reach Programme for eight months, taught PE for three weeks in a local school and had been a Summer Camp Leader for the past six years. In addition, Dara listed soccer and being a First Aider as two of her hobbies.

Dara believed that, in teaching, the mentor provided *"a support for people"* (PETE student, Dara, Questionnaire, September 2006). Dara conveyed that teaching was *"like the Irish weather, changeable - not knowing what to expect. Irish people are like teachers having to acclimatise to it"* (PETE student, Dara, Questionnaire, September 2006). When Dara spoke to teachers, she discovered that they listed *"pupils who were successful in exams and watching a student learn"* as the nadir of teaching (PETE student, Dara, Questionnaire, September 2006). In Dara's opinion, the negative points associated with teaching were *"discipline problems, record keeping, language barriers with foreign students, motivating disinterested pupils"* (PETE student, Dara, Questionnaire, September 2006). In addition, Dara viewed the teacher as being in *"locus parentis"* when teaching pupils (PETE student, Dara,

Questionnaire, September 2006). Therefore, for Dara, a teacher has a strong pastoral role.

(b) Anita (CT)

Anita trained as a PE teacher at a University in the United Kingdom (UK) and had been teaching PE and Mathematics in Ireland for eight years. Anita described high quality PE as the *"provision of new physical skills and enjoyment of activities"* (CT, Anita, Questionnaire, September 2006). Anita endeavoured to deliver a high quality PE programme through *"good preparation, enthusiasm and commitment"* (CT, Anita, Questionnaire, September 2006). Anita reported that an effective PE teacher is one who is a *"good provider of opportunities to learn and enjoy"* (CT, Anita, Questionnaire, September 2006). Difficulties Anita experienced as a PE teacher were, in *"preparation, class behaviour, stress"* (CT, Anita, Questionnaire, September 2006). Anita portrayed an ineffective PE teacher as *"unprepared and unenthusiastic about their subjects"* (CT, Anita, Questionnaire, September 2006).

In terms of being mentored, Anita described how mentoring was a key part of teacher training in the UK: *"it was common practice there and was excellent"* (CT, Anita, Questionnaire, September 2006). Key attributes of a mentor, in Anita's opinion, were *"sharing information and ideas, being patient, enthusiastic"* (CT, Anita, Questionnaire, September 2006). Anita charted her duties as a CT on TP as *"making sure lessons are prepared for, carried out and evaluated"* (CT, Anita, Questionnaire, September 2006). At times, Anita found being a CT *"time consuming"* but in general it was a *"learning experience for all"* (CT, Anita, Questionnaire, September 2006). Anita would like to be rewarded for her work as a CT by being *"sent good teaching students!!!"* (CT, Anita, Questionnaire, September 2006). Anita was *"unsure about the effectiveness of TP assessment as it currently did not involve joint consultations between UTs and CTs"* (CT, Anita, Questionnaire, September 2006).

(c) Liz (UT)

Over the past forty years, Liz had been a PE teacher, Teacher Educator and UT. Liz had worked at Greendale University for thirty-five years; i.e, the majority of her career. The following account charts Liz's views of being a UT, using her post lesson conference with Dara (PETE student) and Anita (CT) as a showcase.

Liz, having finished the post lesson discussion with Anita and Dara, felt that Anita and Dara were united against her and were quite defensive throughout the discussion. It appeared to Liz that Anita and Dara were on one team and Liz was on the other and she commented that the *"dynamics were interesting"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). Liz reflected, wondering which team she was on and said *"if I was asked I'm probably on the kids' team"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). She thought that the lesson had been constructed for her benefit and the pupils had been warned in advance that a UT was coming:

> *Well I thought that they had been told that beforehand. By God, and everybody including the Principal had told them that there are people coming to watch and you have to be good and they had all white t-shirts on and they were all good* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006).

She was astonished that Anita thought the lesson *"was great"* and had *"nothing negative"* to say about Dara's lesson (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). In her opinion, Anita was not *"interrogating the purpose of Dara's aims"*, in order to support her learning. Liz did not challenge what the CT or the PETE student said in these post lesson discussions. She was "*used to saying well ok; I'll leave you there because people* [PETE students and CTs] *get aggressive"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). She said, *"I actually think it's quite unusual to have this conversation"* referring to the fact that she could talk to the researcher on these issues (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006).

Liz was frustrated as she did not think that the Grad Dip PETE student had a *"shared language"* with UTs (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). In contrast, Liz described the level of communication with the final year four-year degree PETE students as *"much more sophisticated"* (UT, Liz, Interview

Tutor, December 4th 2006). Liz thought that *"there was no point in going in and saying do this, this and this"* unless CTs and PETE students were *"engaging with you"* because *"you have to set up a communication channel between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). Liz conveyed that Dara *"would think that her purpose there is to fool me into thinking that she knew volleyball"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). In other words, it was clear that the PETE student did not perceive that the role of the UT was to support her learning. Liz said that she thought both Anita and Dara were colluding, on differing levels, to mask Dara's lack of PCK: *"Anita as well but more Dara really"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). She despaired that Dara wouldn't be honest and say *"you know I don't know very much about volleyball"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). She believed this was because Anita and Dara *"would perceive that my rule is to come in and rubbish it"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). Therefore, this led to Liz hearing a *"yes, yes, yes"* response from both CT and PETE student during the post lesson conference (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). Clearly, Anita and Dara did not feel that they could speak honestly with Liz in the aftermath of the lesson, probably because Liz was viewed as the TP assessor.

Overall, Liz did not believe that Anita and Dara were focusing on pupil learning, and she was critical of their perception that it was *"a good class because she organised them nicely and everyone did what she told them"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). As a result of this, Liz said that she thought Dara was *"teaching the pupils and not educating them"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). Liz intended to raise this question at her forthcoming tutorial with all Grad Dip PETE students. Liz wanted to see a *"shift in pupil learning, not just their confidence"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). From critiquing the PETE students in general, she commented initially that *"they are not able to do that because they don't have sufficient pedagogical skill or content knowledge"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). She qualified this and said *"they may have content but they have no context for it"* and *"presumably they have learned that content in some strange context"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). Liz

imagined that these PETE students developed PCK by *"being taught to take the Junior Cycle syllabus, and were told, in inverted commas, to teach that"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). In fact, if this was the case she thought *"the pupils knew more about volleyball than she will ever know"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006).

The basis for Liz's feelings lay in Dara's understanding of the nature of PE. Liz had asked the group of PETE students on the Grad Dip programme *"what do you think physical education is? They wrote down that it's about fitness and health"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). In addition, Liz commented that she felt the problem with Dara, and her fellow PETE students on the Grad Dip was that they were focussed on getting quick-fix solutions to problems in their teaching and not on the long-term process of education; in other words, *"they were answer driven, rather than process driven"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). Liz also noted that for Dara to learn she *"needed genuine reflection to take her on"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). Liz still felt that all was not lost if Dara would realise this and change her perception of teaching to *"educating pupils"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). Indeed, it was Liz's opinion, that, there was time for Dara *to "educate them [pupils] because they are clearly crying out to be educated"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). She contemplated what it would be like to *"enthuse this group"* and said *"wouldn't it be wonderful?"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). Liz, herself, had an urge to educate the pupils in the class just observed: *"wouldn't you love a chance to have a go with them?"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006).

(d) Mr.Clancy (SP)

Mr. Clancy viewed the school as central to ITE. Overall, he expressed how the school played a *"pivotal role in the education of the next generation of teachers"*. (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). After all, Mr. Clancy said:

> *Somebody has to provide for...for students and you know they need the experience, they need the facility of doing it* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

The school had an Induction programme to help integrate PETE students in

school life, but it was inactive as *"the colleague who acted as mentor for the teachers, both new teachers and student teachers is now unfortunately out on sick leave"* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). Mr. Clancy realised that mentoring PETE students was an arduous process and it was *"not inconsiderable the amount of effort"* in supporting PETE students to learn (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). Mr. Clancy acknowledged the *"support of very strong colleagues"* and said it was a *"relief to him"* that these colleagues supported PETE student learning (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

In terms of design of TP, Mr. Clancy felt it was crucial that a PETE student would be in the school from the beginning of the school year:

> *I mean I was a big fan of the fact that they start at the start of the year. And they...they get used to the kind of structures that need to...it takes a while to settle in ...rather than walking in and seeing every class and everything divided and everything organised* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. Clancy believed that this was a very positive aspect of the Grad Dip programme.

With regard to student teacher assessment, Mr. Clancy advocated School Principal involvement saying: *"he would feel well entitled to comment on her [Dara's] progress"*. He continued: *"You know, I certainly feel that my comments, in so far as I would be able to offer them, should have weighting"* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). When Mr. Clancy described the relationship between the school and the university, he said that often the University assumed that the school would take many student teachers but he was firm on this issue:

> *There is an assumption that I will take more and more. I am trying to cut back a little do you know. For example I am expected to take two students soon and I have said I will take one* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. Clancy was disparaging about the University's recent request for School Principals to become involved in their Mentoring Scheme [Masters in Educational Mentoring programme, see p.2] and thought that there was *"an element of tokenism about it to some extent you know"* as he did not feel that Principals were valued in ITE (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February

16th 2007). Mr. Clancy portrayed the current system of PETE student placement in schools as *"a little bit ad hoc...trial and error"* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). He said that the support of schools for *"student learning was not to be assumed"* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). Mr. Clancy described schools being *"undervalued"* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). To rectify this, he would like to see a *"programme of support, mutual support up to and including financial support"* between school and university (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

In Mr. Clancy's view, the School Principal has a pivotal role in the recruitment of teachers. He believed that this was something that Universities needed to consider carefully, as they were currently excluding school principals from the process of TP assessment. In order to acknowledge the role of the School Principal as future employer of student teachers, Mr. Clancy was asked about the teacher qualities he valued:

> *I am looking for evidence of what really it is all about which is classroom management...someone who is a team player, but will demonstrate the ability to manage his or her classroom and that subtle thing between someone who doesn't go on a solo run and yet somebody who will be strong in the classroom* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. Clancy wanted to *"employ teachers who offered extra curricular activities"* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). In addition, he valued a teacher *"who will have a pastoral care perspective too and an empathy or a support or a feeling of...you know, inclusivity, integration toward pupils* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

The Relationships between Key Participants in the Tetrad

(a) The relationship between Dara (PETE student) and Anita (CT)

From Dara's perspective:

Dara (PETE student) was very enthusiastic about working with Anita (CT). She said *"we kind of think the same, cos when I came in here I thought oh my God this is exactly what I want"* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 1, November 20th 2006). Dara was very impressed with Anita's organisation and found that *"Anita's PE lessons are the exact same structure as what I would have done, anyway, which is actually good, she's doing the same things as me"* (PETE

student, Dara, Interview 1, November 20th 2006). Dara was also delighted to discover that Anita planned for both the short and the long-term, as she had *"her own schemes"* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 1, November 20th 2006). However by the end of TP, Dara would decide on which lessons Anita needed to observe and give feedback:

> *Well like if...like some of my classes now...I...I ask Anita to...do you know would she take notes in each class because I don't ask her to do it on all of them, anymore, as I don't need it anymore* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

Overall, Dara portrayed Anita as:

> *Being great like she has helped me loads. She has given me ideas and stuff, because she has a lot of resources you know, below in the PE hall that I use* (PETE student, Dara, Interview, 3, February 16th 2007).

Dara believed that *"Anita had way better...better resources, better than the University and sometimes she just came up with a lot of stuff herself"* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). Dara acknowledged *"when you (PETE student) go out (on TP) you need practical examples"* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). Dara cited gymnastics to illustrate this, and recalled that when she researched it she *"found she couldn't find much"* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). To address this, Dara decided to go directly to the Greendale Gymnastics Tutor and *"borrowed it off one of the tutors inside, do you know, the gymnastic guides...the guidelines [and that this was] great in comparison to the books"* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). Dara also said that they did *"barely...any practical"* in Greendale and talking to Anita and other Tutors was the only way she could learn PCK (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). Dara added that not all the PETE students were as resourceful in gathering PCK:

> *I know some people [PETE students] some people find it very hard. But I don't know, I just try and improvise with what I have. You still have to do it yourself. That's what I think...you have to do it yourself. I think it's the same with any other subject. You are taught only so much at college* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

Dara did say that Greendale University allowed the PETE students onto the course because *"we are supposed to have everything covered in Brightwater"* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). Dara summarised how she assimilated her PCK:

> *And I feel like that I can use bits of Brightwater...maybe a bit from a book here or there and maybe a bit from Anita's notes, and just put it all together* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

From Anita's perspective:

Anita adopted a very hands-on approach to mentoring Dara. She described how Dara and she *"always meet before the lesson"* (CT, Anita, Interview 1, November 20th 2006). Anita invited Dara to her home to develop lesson plans and *"go through ideas"* (CT, Anita, Interview 1, November 20th 2006). Anita always ensured that she met Dara *"directly after the lesson"* (CT, Anita, Interview 1, November 20th 2006). Initially, the contact between Anita and Dara was quite intense, particularly in the first three weeks. Anita described how Dara *"kind of went through an awful lot then"* (CT, Anita, Interview 1, November 20th 2006). In order to bolster Dara's PCK, Anita had *"given her a lot of books and materials"* (CT, Anita, Interview 1, November 20th 2006). In spite of the obvious support Anita gave to Dara, Anita reported being unsure of how to mentor a student teacher, as she had not been trained for this role. She said was not clear on:

> *Exactly what I am doing cause I don't have any guidelines of how to be a mentor. There is no training. I just go through things with her before and after the class* (CT, Anita, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

When asked if she liaised with other mentors to compare mentoring strategies, Anita said, *"I don't have any contact with any other mentors"* (CT, Anita, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

(b) Relationship between Dara (PETE student), Liz (UT) and Anita (CT)

This relationship was captured during a post lesson conference between Dara, Liz and Anita. The researcher was invited to 'sit in' on this conversation. Dara described how she had bribed the pupils to behave in advance of the lesson:

> *See that lady down there, she's an inspector, if you are really good, I'll bring you in sweets next week, and one pupil said 'oh I'll be so good', and every time I said remember the sweets now, he was very good* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

After the lesson, Liz commented about the pupil performance:

> *They are quite good at it and they have quite a lot of skill so where are you going to take that? You have them down as well behaved, they are quite good at it and where is that going next?* (UT, Liz, Post lesson conference, December 4th 2006).

Dara was keen for pupils to have fun during the class:

> *I want to get them enjoying it. I don't care how many times it bounced or anything, for some of them. Just once they are able to get a few rallies going* (PETE student, Dara, Post lesson conference, December 4th 2006).

Then Liz suddenly became more specific in her questioning, wanting to find out about Dara's objectives for the lesson: *"I looked at your lesson briefly, what exactly were you teaching them today, what was the main thing? The serve?"* (UT, Liz, Post Lesson Conference, December 4th 2006). Liz felt that this was a difficult skill to teach in a first lesson: *"Ya that's a hard enough skill to teach them. Why would you teach them that early on?"* (UT, Liz, Post Lesson Conference, December 4th 2006). She softened the question saying *"I'm not trying to catch you out or anything?"* (UT, Liz, Post Lesson Conference, December 4th 2006). Dara defended her choice of skill order saying, *"I would do the skills in the same sort of order"* (PETE student, Dara, Post Lesson Conference, December 4th 2006). However, Liz noted that most pupils were were very much beginners, with some more able, and wanted to know if Dara had thought about learning progression:

> *Their (pupils) skills are very raw. They are not actually refined skills and again probed 'how you go from there where they are?' Some of them are better than others and some are very poor* (UT, Liz, Post Lesson Conference, December 4th 2006).

Liz wondered how Dara might reach all the abilities in the class: *"Would you have some high nets and some low nets? or would you have them all on the high nets?"* (UT, Liz, Post Lesson Conference, December 4th 2006). Liz advised to *"let the pupils choose and if I were you, I would then have a go at J4"* (UT, Liz, Post Lesson Conference, December 4th 2006) [J4 is an approach to teaching volleyball to beginners]. Liz then queried how Dara was teaching the skills and was unhappy about this aspect of the lesson:

> *There was no attempt to draw the whole class in and say alright stop for a minute, so and so over there is doing it quite well, have a look at him. Why did you think he was doing it well, now how could you do that, do it again and we'll see it. So you are teaching the whole class by using him as a demonstration* (UT, Liz, Post Lesson Conference, December 4th 2006).

Furthermore, Liz criticised the way that Dara would say *"excellent, very good and we don't particularly know what was excellent about it or why it was very*

good" (UT, Liz, Post Lesson Conference, December 4th 2006). Therefore the pupils lost a key learning opportunity. Once more Liz tried to temper the comment, leading in gently:

> *And I'm not being picky. But that was their chance they went away and said oh ya you use two hands and that's excellent, very good. Does that make sense?* (UT, Liz, Post Lesson Conference, December 4th 2006).

The critique was not wholly negative and Liz did have some encouraging comments to make on Dara's performance:

> *You had them all enthused, you'd everybody working, your presence was quite clear. You were somebody who was going to be there giving a hand if it was needed. Your voice was very good. All of those things were very good* (Liz, UT, Post Lesson Conference, December 4th 2006)

What was interesting in this post lesson conference was that neither Dara or Anita responded to the critique. Liz was very taken aback that neither Dara nor Anita had engaged with her: *"It's a bit strange doing this with a quiet audience and nobody else is saying... except Dara saying yes"* (UT, Liz, Post Lesson Conference Interview 2, December 4th 2006). To break the silence, Liz then asked Anita to give her feedback *"Now Anita before we go do you want to throw in your bits and we can add that to the pile?"* (UT, Liz, Post Lesson Conference, December 4th 2006). Anita immediately jumped to Dara's defence:

> *Ya, I just think Dara needs to be praised. It was a very well organised class and very well prepared. She had thought an awful lot about the group and the dynamics. The group is quite hard a group to teach. Every teacher struggles with this class* (CT, Anita, Post Lesson Conference, December 4th 2006).

Liz accepted this comment and said:

> *OK, so a nice atmosphere created and lesson carefully worked, so there were lots of good points clearly but lots of things can happen to make it better, to make it more meaningful for them* (UT, Liz, Post Lesson Conference, December 4th 2006).

Liz also accepted that the group dynamic was difficult in this class because the majority of the pupils had little English, many being immigrants from Poland and Latvia, and it was difficult to communicate with them. She suggested that:

> *It might even be worth your while to make out posters and charts to stick up for them so that it becomes visual as opposed to verbal* (UT, Liz, Post Lesson Conference, December 4th 2006).

Directing her comments at Dara, Liz then tried to make sense of the critique,

pointing out that in order to improve her teaching, Dara needed to be made aware of both the positive and negative aspects of her performance, because "*at this stage of your career we can't be telling you all good things, be saying very good, excellent*" (UT, Liz, Post Lesson Conference, December 4th 2006). When the post lesson conference had ended and Liz had left the PE Hall, Anita immediately undermined Liz's post lesson critique and said to Dara that she felt the lesson had been good:

> *Everything that I would look for, your jewellery, the kit, everything was right. They enjoyed it. It was nice and they understood it. They knew what they were meant to be doing. Sometimes it's hard and you have to run through things a couple of times till they understand what's going on. It was well run and they knew what was going on. They are getting better at that and now you know their names* (CT, Anita, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

Anita continued, observing an improvement in Dara's classroom management skills: "*Do you know what I thought was excellent? You are becoming really classroom aware. You can see everything that is going on*" (CT, Anita, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). Anita recommended that to prepare for Liz's next visit, Dara needed to practise a Teaching Games for Understanding approach: "*Liz may want to see you teaching games for understanding so you may have to revert to it anyway*" (CT, Anita, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). Dara was disappointed with Liz's feedback, as she had been happy with her performance. She believed that she had achieved her main objective, i.e. to ensure that the pupils were well behaved. She felt:

> *Well grand, but she [Liz] had very little positive to say about it and I thought it was a brilliant class because one of my main objectives is, and its not even in my lesson, for myself was that they were well behaved as a class* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

Overall, Dara thought that Liz and the other UTs at Greendale University were not in tune with current Irish pupils in current classrooms. Dismissing UT expertise, she commented that she thought they were in:

> *Fairy land...thirty perfect students in your class and nothing can go wrong but that's not the way it happens at all...They think students if you ask them to do something that they will do it* (PETE student, Dara, Focus Group, March 29th 2007).

(c) Relationship between Dara (PETE student) and Lillian (Education UT)

Dara described a visit from her Education Tutor, Lillian, who was based in the EPS department of Greendale University and was Dara's second UT. Lillian's

expertise was in Science Teaching. It was clear that even though Lillian *"read through her folio for most of it I think she didn't know what I was doing. Being honest like..."* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). In the post lesson discussion, Dara said Lillian said *"oh it was great when you did all the hopping and jumping"* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). Dara was alarmed because she *"was doing basketball and Lillian didn't know what I was on about"* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). The same UT came to another PETE student's soccer class and:

> *Was wondering to one of the girls [PETE students] where they would sit...how...like where the teacher would be positioned in the class so she could sit near them* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

The PETE student told Lillian that *"she was going to be moving around"* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). After the lesson Lillian was anxious about safety in the soccer lesson and said:

> *That it was a bit dangerous, because they were all running in different directions. And she wanted to know was there any way you could get people playing soccer and all everyone running in the same direction?* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

Dara did try to excuse Lillian's lack of expertise in PE, believing that some UTs were not trained to be TP tutors in PE, and so did not know what they were doing:

> *I suppose it's just a new experience for them as well, because like they don't know what they are doing...they are kind of thrown in at the deep end as well you know* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

(d) The relationship between Dara (PETE student) and Mr. Clancy (SP)

Mr. Clancy described how he had high expectations of Dara (PETE student)

> *Given that I suppose I feel because as a graduate I just feel there is more maturity there and maybe I expected a little bit more too, you know* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

When Mr. Clancy portrayed Dara's progress, he said that *"she is very very good and it has been a fantastic experience"* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). Mr. Clancy illustrated how Dara was *"treated as a member of staff as the student differential isn't quite as there. So that is a subtle...a subtle distinction"* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). Mr. Clancy felt that in Dara, he was dealing *"with a teacher...in a positive sense"* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). Mr.

Clancy clarified this saying that:

> *Our expectations are high and we...we feel that you know she is somebody who is in charge and who can be given that extra responsibility* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Dara had been asked to teach Religion, even though she was unqualified to do so. In order to prepare for this, Dara described how she was *"kind of just learning it [religion] herself in the evening"* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). In addition, in spite of Dara being an unqualified teacher, Mr. Clancy gave Dara substitution classes on days *"like today which is a very bad day with so many teachers missing"* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). Mr. Clancy did say that he thought that Dara was an unusual student teacher in that *"she could be given more teaching responsibility and it wasn't always the case"* in a student teacher (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). Dara seemed delighted that the Principal had asked her to take extra classes. This may have been because the Principal seemed to value her skills. In order to improve her employment chances, Dara had identified another key skill needed for teaching. She had noticed that the demographic of schools had changed in Ireland, with *"international students in all the schools, do you know, over the next few years"* and wanted to get a Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) qualification. Dara thought that *"it would be a...like a great thing to have"* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

(e) The relationship between Anita (CT) – Mr. Clancy (SP)

Mr. Clancy acknowledged that the school had a key role to play in supporting PETE students to learn during TP. In addition, Mr. Clancy valued the work done by Anita describing her as a *"very strong colleague"*. Mr. Clancy was thankful for her support of the PETE student *"it's a relief to me that when I take in a student teacher in the PE department that Anita will look after her very well"* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

(f) The relationship between Liz (UT) – Mr. Clancy (Principal)

Mr. Clancy spoke of the calibre of Greendale Tutors as being *"top class and generally speaking very good....very approachable...very positive about the school and its support, and love to get a feel for the person that they*

are...they are monitoring" (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). He seemed very pleased with their level of expertise and their relationship with his school.

Summary

Dara (PETE student) was delighted to work with Anita (CT) in this school. She described how the *"set up was exactly what she wanted"* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 1, November 20th 2006). Dara valued Anita's help, from inviting her into her home to design lesson plans, and borrow lesson materials, to giving pre and post lesson feedback. However, As TP progressed, Dara's confidence grew and she began to control the amount of Anita's learning support. Dara viewed Liz (UT) as an assessor only and not a guide to support her learning. In addition, Dara believed that all UTs were out of touch with the reality of schools and that their guidance was incongruent with the realities of Irish pupils. Anita agreed with this view.

Anita, although an untrained mentor for TP, had experienced being mentored when training to be a PE teacher in the UK. She appeared to be very helpful to Dara in the preparation and critique of lessons in the earlier stages of TP. Later on, Dara appeared to dictate the level of help given by Anita. Anita believed that her role was to support Dara's learning and to defend and protect her from Liz's (UT) critique.

Liz (UT) was concerned about Dara's low level of PCK and the fact that she was teaching pupils, not educating them. She believed that Dara was not being honest with her about this. In addition, she was dismayed at both Dara and Anita's lack of acceptance of her post lesson critique and was concerned that Anita thought Dara was teaching to a high level.

Mr. Clancy believed that the school was pivotal in teacher education and as such the SP and CT should have a role in the PETE student assessment. However, he felt that the relationship between the school and the University was *"ad hoc"* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007) and that the school was undervalued and taken for granted in the TP process. He appeared to be very impressed by Dara's maturity and gave her classes to

supervise and Religion classes to teach. In addition, Mr. Clancy was impressed by the calibre of Greendale Tutors assessing PETE students.

Chapter Eleven: Case Study Five - Edel

Introduction

In this chapter, a vignette of Case Study Five is presented. This case study has PETE student Edel as a focal point, surrounded by three other participants: Joan, the cooperating teacher (CT), Claire, the Greendale University Tutor (UT) and Mr. Noonan, the School Principal (SP) of Bayview Community School. This vignette is divided into two key aspects:

1. Biography and views of participants on the TP process.
2. The relationships between key participants in the tetrad.

Biography and Views of Participants on the TP Process

(a) Edel (PETE Student)

As with the other PETE students, Edel was a graduate of Brightwater University and spent five years studying a B.Sc. in Health, Fitness and Leisure Studies there, where she emerged first in her class. Edel applied for the Grad Dip:

> *To gain a wider subject knowledge and understanding of PE and what it takes to be a PE teacher. To broaden and refine the skills that I already have, to make me the best teacher I can be* (PETE student, Edel, Questionnaire, September 2006).

Edel had extensive experience as an Adventure Sports Instructor specializing in Rock climbing and abseiling. In addition she was a Relief Manager for a city sports clothing retail outlet (PETE student, Edel, Questionnaire, September 2006). Edel also listed soccer, tag-rugby, cycling, running and badminton as her hobbies. She had PE teaching experience working in a Mid West School for hearing impaired pupils (PETE student, Edel, Questionnaire, September 2006).

Edel viewed a mentor as having a fundamental role in her learning:

> *Someone I can learn from, be guided towards the right path in teaching, see different approaches to teaching...their method versus your own values/beliefs, a role model that can advise* (PETE student, Edel, Questionnaire, September 2006).

Edel had first-hand experience of being mentored and portrayed her mentor as *"a great teacher in my eyes, he gave good advice, got you thinking*

'outside' the box when it comes to lesson plans" (PETE student, Edel, Questionnaire, September 2006). In addition, she described how her mentor had faith in her ability "*he knew that I could do these things, even though I doubted myself at times*" (PETE student, Edel, Questionnaire, September 2006). Edel charted the key skills of a good quality mentor as "*how to give feedback effectively in the form of praise, positive reinforcements, encouragement and empathy*" (Questionnaire, September 2006). Furthermore, Edel believed that the mentor should be able to help the PETE student to:

> *Plan and prepare effectively for people with different abilities in the class and to demonstrate different teaching styles Mosston's spectrum, 'command', 'practice', reciprocal, guided discovery, self-check, evaluate each lesson* (PETE student, Edel, Questionnaire, September 2006).

When describing a teacher, Edel used the following metaphor to capture this notion:

> *I am a gardener. Students represent the contents of my garden. Contents of which consist of a wide variety of flowers of different colours, shapes and sizes. This represents my awareness of the differences in students and how each have individual needs* (PETE student, Edel, Questionnaire, September 2006).

Edel was animated when she portrayed the aspects of teaching which she found most enjoyable: "*interacting with students, their feedback, the rapport, when you realise they're assimilating the information you've given them*" (PETE student, Edel, Questionnaire, September 2006). She was also aware of some of the difficulties faced by PE teachers in the classroom and cited the following: "*unruly students that try to 'hijack the class' to the detriment of majority of the class...time issue here*" (PETE student, Edel, Questionnaire, September 2006). Edel added to this and said that outside the classroom there were other negative forces which undermined the PE teacher's work such as:

> *Parental attitudes to school when disciplining students. They can undermine your authority e.g. notes. Also lack of facilities are a problem for the PE teacher* (PETE student, Edel, Questionnaire, September 2006).

(b) Joan (CT)

Joan had been teaching PE and English for the past ten years, the majority of which had been at Bayview Community School in a rural town. She described

teaching PE as *"very demanding and can become mundane over a period of time"* (CT, Joan, Questionnaire, September 2006). When asked to describe an effective PE teacher, Joan said *"a teacher who is motivated, competent and ensures that learning is taking place and a teacher whose students enjoy learning"* (CT, Joan, Questionnaire, September 2006). In Joan's eyes an ineffective teacher was one who *"has no interest in teaching and throws in the ball"* (CT, Joan, Questionnaire, September 2006). Joan felt that she was going through a difficult patch in her career saying that she suffered from *"tiredness and lack of motivation"* (CT, Joan, Questionnaire, September 2006).

On the subject of mentoring, Joan charted her own experiences as a student teacher where *"the teacher did not really act as a mentor. More times than not, they were not present while I taught"* (CT, Joan, Interview 1, November 13th 2006). She described two very specific experiences of being mentored. On her first TP, she found the PE teacher entirely unsupportive *"when it came to my teaching, they stayed for the first week to make sure that I was okay and that was it. No feedback at all. Nothing"* (CT, Joan, Interview 2, December 11th 2006). In her final TP, she was placed in a school with an unsupportive PE teacher, who:

> *Was a lovely woman, but I was completely on my own. So much so, that, she would give me evening classes on a Friday so she could head off home at lunchtime. You know you were travelling then, cause I was down from Ballinvee, getting buses* (CT, Joan, Interview 2, December 11th 2006).

Joan contended that she "*didn't learn anything from her, nothing, except that I know how not to treat people*" and that *"I would have loved to have feedback, I think I would have learned a lot more"* (CT, Joan, Interview 2, December 11th 2006). In fact, Joan learned more about PE from her UT *"I really learned so much when a tutor arrived and she was examining you"* (CT, Joan, Interview 2, December 11th 2006). Interestingly, in addition, one year she learned more from her English CT than her PE CT:

> *She was just extremely helpful in letting me know that this student maybe weak and this student maybe troublesome and that person responds really well to encouragement. Just a few little things and gave me huge amount of praise and encouragement* (CT, Joan, Interview 2, December 11th 2006).

Joan's confidence increased when she realised that the teacher who praised and encouraged her, was both an excellent and well-respected practitioner

herself: *"she was an excellent teacher herself and the fact that she thought I was good, I was delighted"* (CT, Joan, Interview 2, December 11th 2006).

Joan's own philosophy of mentoring seemed to emanate from this formative teaching experience: *"big bear teaching little bear to fend for themselves through exploring, observing, experimenting and evaluating - this will lead to baby bear learning a lot"* (CT, Joan, Questionnaire, September 2006). She sketched the qualities of a mentor as being: *"friendly, positive, supportive, approachable"* (CT, Joan, Questionnaire, September 2006). These were qualities which Joan brought to her role as CT where she described joint consultation with the PETE student: *"looking at lesson plans, observing student teacher, evaluating lesson with the student teacher"* (CT, Joan, Questionnaire, September 2006). Joan said that currently the university did not acknowledge her work as CT and she would like: *"A thank you letter from the college or a small payment for tutorials with student teacher"* (CT, Joan, Questionnaire, September 2006). Having spent a lot of time supporting the PETE student's learning, Joan asserted that the CT *"should have a more effective role where the supervisor wants feedback from us as to the progress of the student teacher"* (CT, Joan, Questionnaire, September 2006). The quality of TP assessment was, in Joan's opinion, *"not good"* (CT, Joan, Questionnaire, September 2006). It was difficult to comprehend how UTs, who have little access to PETE students, could make a unilateral decision on the TP grade: *"Tutors who visit a school 4 times over a period of 10 weeks cannot have a clear insight into the abilities of the student teacher"* (CT, Joan, Questionnaire, September 2006).

(c) Claire (UT)

A detailed resumé of Claire's expertise and thoughts on TP are outlined in Chapters Eight and Nine. As was noted earlier, Claire designed a *"little sort of handout for them so that they could actually use it to provide feedback, so as to guide their feedback"* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007). This handout guided Joan's observation of lessons and was reviewed by both Joan and Edel in a post lesson conference. In addition, Edel found this observation sheet an excellent reference point when writing her post lesson reflections.

(d) Mr. Noonan (SP)

Mr. Noonan has been Principal of Bayview Community School for the past eight years. The school had an active Induction Programme for student teachers and beginning teachers. Mr. Noonan described the teacher leading Induction as *"being really in charge of any of the people that come in for instance on teaching practice, or people that would be involved in language assistance"* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). In terms of her personality, he felt that the Coordinator of this Induction Programme *"was a very personable, nice girl"* and that this was important as he found it was *"good to have some kind of nice friendly face, someone that they can come back to"* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. Noonan saw the school as having a central role in ITE and said *"It's as much important as looking after the kids in a lot of ways"*. (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). Mr. Noonan expanded on this point and said that:

> *Well I suppose as a professional in the field and as somebody that is involved in any way in terms of leadership within a school I think you have to understand that you have a big function to play in terms of mentoring new teachers. You are trying to create ....I suppose a body of...of...of teachers for the future, and for your own context as well* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Within ITE, the school provided the student teacher with a real view of both schooling and teaching. The School Principal was often very well placed to give an insight into the running of a school, through university-based lectures and TP tutorials, but this resource was currently being ignored by the university:

> *But I wonder in teacher education, is there any involvement of Principals at all, or administrators of schools, do they have any inputs?* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Because Principals were not included in ITE, Mr. Noonan firmly believed that a lot of young teachers have no real understanding of how schools really operate. He also commented on the fact that PETE students: *"probably never set foot in the [School Principal's] office"* and therefore it was important for them to:

> *To know like where principals are coming from...what is the psyche...what are we looking for...why are we looking for it? And what they need to do to impress? Because you need...we all have to impress our bosses like do you know what I mean?* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2006).

Mr. Noonan believed that school was the primary ITE site of student learning not the university: *"as you learn more in what you do in the school I am afraid than you do in lectures"* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). Therefore, he advocated that PETE students should spend *"a whole...like effectively a year...a school year...eight months or something in a school."* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). It was clear that Mr. Noonan felt that the current form of TP did not support PETE student learning, as it was a very fractured experience:

> *Here they are sporadically in for bits and pieces and it's dreadful from a school's perspective. There is no proper ....you know, mentoring really going on in my view, until you actually have people on the ground* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

He felt that PETE students had difficulty in coping with timetables:

> *The class would roll over a good 15 minutes after the time. And you could imagine the chaos because you would have say third years and they would be supposed to be in Maths or something and I really would be very intolerant of people in physical education particularly, and...but particularly in physical education, because that is their business, do you know?* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. Noonan added that, as a teacher: *"management of time is the most critical thing they have to do"* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). He worried that:

> *Sometimes the bus would be back here at around 3.50 instead of...or 3.45 and sometimes it's 3.45 because they finish at 4.00 like. Well they can...like I have seen some of those student teachers now, and they will just kind of walk off the bus. The kids will just be left wander off home* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

He found this slightly alarming and he could get a *"pulmonary thinking about it, And I...it comes down to really in my view that they [student teachers] are not getting enough time in school"* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). He blamed this PETE student behaviour on the fact they are not getting enough formal educational experience within the school.

Mr. Noonan also criticised the timing of the start of TP and was angry that

Edel had been involved in lectures for Grad Dip Induction, when she should have been attending the school meetings at the start of the new school year:

> *Anyway. Edel never turned up right. And I was a bit annoyed now. I remember going out to the phone at around 10 o'clock or 11 o'clock and ringing...couldn't get through to her, couldn't get through to somebody else. Then I eventually contacted the university, and they were toing and froing about the fact that she was actually in lectures...they were told they had to be at these key lectures at the beginning* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. Noonan was very frustrated at this and did grapple with the idea of not having Grad Dip students in the school in future years. The University did not seem to recognise the importance of this first week in schools, which set the scene for the entire school year in terms of planning and organisation:

> *I have to say now that I...it nearly put me off even having a Grad Dip again. Because I said to myself if they.... if the university is so out of touch that they can't see how important it is for a school. Now, maybe not every principal would want them in at the beginning. But, I think any school worth their salt, they are going to take, you know, teacher education seriously* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Given his perception of the importance of the school in ITE, Mr. Noonan was very unhappy with how the school is treated by the university:

> *In fact the school is quite peripheral to the whole affair. It is kind of like as if you are...you are...you are really just...there is a certain desperation I often feel about getting people into places, whether they fit or they don't fit. They are obviously trying to get an awful lot of people sorted very quickly* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Fundamentally, he believed that the university did not adopt a professional approach to dealing with schools on TP: *"if there was more of a professional approach to how they dealt with schools, I think schools would respond professionally* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). Thus, he felt that the school-university relationship was balanced in favour of the university. This needed to change to a more egalitarian arrangement: *"the most important thing really is that the university needs to get real in terms of who is serving who, number one."* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). In Mr. Noonan's eyes, the university were suiting themselves:

> *The whole system is all geared towards suiting the university and not the schools. This is where they have it all wrong. And like...it's lovely like from their perspective. But, I mean, we are organisations, and I can guarantee it would be different if it was*

the private sector, they are trying to suit H Group and places like that, do you know (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. Noonan described the clinical relationship between school and university:

Once we are on the books there we are kind of on their list of people that generally provide placement. So we would get a letter from the university asking us would we offer a placement for two students or one student in the PE department. We are told really that...that this is the name of the person that is coming and this is their subject. And you know you feel like you are being taking a little bit for granted, you know. (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. Noonan was very unhappy with this arrangement because student teachers were not matched with suitable schools. As an employer, Mr. Noonan felt that he should choose the student teacher most suited to his school context:

It's kind of like the cart before the horse...I think the schools should have some element of...of choice about the type of person that is coming in (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. Noonan would prefer the placement of student teachers to be more akin to work placement in industry:

Like for instance if it was the co-operative office for industry we would have a chance to interview (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. Noonan saw TP as an opportunity for a student teacher to showcase his/her ability to the Principal, with a view to being employed by the school on graduation:

Whatever about second years, particularly fourth years, because for them it would be a great value. But for...but for us it would give you...you would get a certain element of choice about how that....the right person for it. And I think you...there would be better buy in from the principals because they would feel, well look I had a part in the appointment of that person. I kind of...I am going to really work hard (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

With regard to assessment of TP, schools were, again, ignored by the university. Mr. Noonan wanted CTs to be more central to the process and also said that the UT was *"certainly not querying the Principal you know... no proper structure where the Principal really has an opportunity to evaluate them"* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). He added that:

If there was a structure there where I knew that I was feeding back. Well then I would be doing a little bit more from my end. Because I know I would have to kind of give

the person [student teacher] a reasonable chance (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. Noonan stated that the university did not have an official feedback protocol for the school:

There does not seem to be any mechanism to give feedback in place, for example, if I have been unhappy with somebody or I felt that really like something needs to be said here, I have made it my business to make sure of the thing. But I ...I don't think it should be necessary for me to go into that effort (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. Noonan advocated a trilateral assessment system of student teacher learning that included the Principal, CT and UT:

And I would be quite happy. ...And I would say most principals would be very happy to set up a...a fairly ....you know....you know a system that has integrity within the school, to make sure that there is a fair and objective assessment of that candidate. I mean I am not going to sit and talk about somebody that I am not really familiar with. I will do...what I have done before on the occasions that I have had that kind of involvement, is that I will go and have a meeting with the co-operating teachers and I will get a feel (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. Noonan believed that mentoring was the optimal approach for teacher education and acknowledged that Greendale University had launched a Masters of Education in Educational Mentoring (see p.2):

I would be open to that. But I think it is very difficult the way they are operating now, that mentor's course, which is great now, it's a great positive move (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

However, Mr. Noonan did not think the design suited schools. He suggested that the university, if committed to the idea of mentors, could implement a mentor-training programme by being more flexible and lateral thinking:

When it comes to physical education it wouldn't be that difficult for the university to be creative, to release some of those teachers and replace them with....with an alternative maybe. You know, with...by agreement, for a period of time, to get them trained fairly quickly, but...but effectively you know (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. Noonan felt it would work for schools, if there were set periods of time during the year when mentors were being trained and *"a proper replacement when teachers were absent from class to attend mentor training"* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). Suitable candidates for mentor-training should, in Mr. Noonan's opinion, have a minimum of five years

teaching experience. This judgement was based on teaching expertise:

> *I mean they expect five years for people to take a senior position in a school. And I think that...I mean I think we should take the...the mentoring just as serious* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

He believed that mentoring was central to teacher education and was a proven mechanism of education. Therefore, it needed to be embraced by teacher educators as: *"Everyone knows apprenticeship is the way to go. Like you know it's the way it started and that's the way it is going to have to go eventually."* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

The Relationships between Key Participants in the Tetrad

(a) Edel (PETE student) and Joan (CT)

From Edel's perspective:

Joan would preview each lesson plan, in advance of the lesson: *"I gave Joan (CT) a look at the lesson plan briefly"* (PETE student, Edel, Interview 1, November 13th 2006). Joan then used a post lesson appraisal form, designed by Claire (UT) to give feedback on the lesson. Edel thought that she learned a lot from this process, as it was *"looking back on maybe the positive aspects and negative, so constructive and so it was very handy"* (PETE student, Edel, Interview 1, November 13th 2006). Edel took it from Joan *"straight away...and then I get to talk through it briefly at the end of the lesson"* (PETE student, Edel, Interview 1, November 13th 2006). Edel found this form very useful during her post lesson reflection:

> *As I am doin' my post lesson appraisals, I've been able to think back and look at what they have said and my own personal opinions, so I can work towards it for the next lesson* (PETE student, Edel, Interview 1, November 13th 2006).

However, Edel knew that not all PETE students found the reflective process helpful:

> *The reflective practise thing works but I don't think everyone is doing it. They mightn't be doing it as detailed. Some people think that it's a drudge and it is a drudge but after, they really do help and I think they are important for you to grow as a teacher, it is important for yourself, I suppose you are learning it as you go on* (PETE student, Edel, Interview 2, December 11th 2006).

Edel was very open to both Joan and Trevor (the other CT) observing and critiquing her lesson: *"I am completely comfy with them now...yeah cause they are lovely. They are really helpful"*. (PETE student, Edel, Interview 2, December 11th 2006). However, when TP was over Edel noticed that Joan

was *"kind of finished with PE, because she loved when I was taking the classes like"* (PETE student, Edel, Interview 2, December 11th 2006). In spite of this, Edel did still think that:

> *She [Joan] was still...you know, really helpful. But I think once she...once she knew I was fine, she did sit in....sit in on classes and stuff. But do you know it would be like, oh yes, that was great do you know (PETE student, Edel, Focus Group, March 29th 2007).*

The other CT, Trevor tended to give more detailed feedback than Joan throughout TP:

> *Whereas Trevor, my other teacher, in the mornings like...the class might have went grand, but then he would...like you know he would fill out a thing and he would pick out things that I could improve on like. Whereas she [Joan] maybe didn't* (PETE student, Edel, Focus Group, March 29th 2007).

As TP progressed, Edel felt that the level of Joan's learning support diminished over TP, and that eventually she was just "there":

> *For guidance, but I think that when you start teaching you actually seem to develop your own style, you know, you don't actually copy the way that they [Joan and Trevor] teach you might get tips from...or you know, like say even with discipline problems or whatever...or guidance in that...in that way* (PETE student, Edel, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

Edel thought that *"when you start doing it yourself you actually, it just becomes your own way. You don't actually kind of follow exactly what they are doing"* (PETE student, Edel, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). Edel described how she felt about teaching at the end of TP and said that her reflections were shorter as: *"I don't have as much to talk about, because I am managing it more"* (PETE student, Edel, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). In addition, Edel explained that she felt more prepared for class: *"you go in guns blazing and you know how you are going to deal with it before it happens"* (PETE student, Edel, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). Because of this she felt:

> *More confident this term as well. And I think that little hitches that would have been bigger things in the first semester, I am dealing with...even...easier this semester"* (PETE student, Edel, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

Edel felt that she did not need as much learning support from CTs, in the latter stages of TP:

> *I feel like that if you have them kind of very...beside your side at every class I think that ...well for myself I think am I annoying them nearly at this...this stage? Not that*

> *they make you feel that way, because they have actually never have butted in. I think that you need to kind of go out on your own as well and kind of learn your own* (PETE student, Edel, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

From Joan's perspective:

Joan portrayed being a CT as *"a lot of work"* as PETE students were *"more needy and demanding"* (CT, Joan, Questionnaire, September 2006). In addition: *"the facilities in school were bad (but improving) and that at the university there were for example 30 volleyballs for 30 PETE students"* (CT, Joan, Interview 1, November 13th 2006). Often the University scenario bore no relationship to the reality of some schools' equipment. Joan thought that there were many benefits to working with PETE students. There were opportunities to look at *"new ideas, that PETE students were encouraged to be creative in college and there were a variety of things they can do"* (CT, Joan, Interview 1, November 13th 2006). Also, interacting with PETE students prevented Joan from getting into *"a rut"* in her teaching (CT, Joan, Interview 1, November 13th 2006).

Joan commented that it was difficult to support PETE student learning, as currently it was *"not possible to timetable this"* (CT, Joan, Interview 1, November 13th 2006). She suggested that the university could *"pay schools to provide one hour a week"* to mentor PETE students (CT, Joan, Interview 1, November 13th 2006). Joan's own experience of being mentored by CTs was basically *"take classes and off they would go"* and feedback from CTs was very *"personal, horrible"* (CT, Joan, Interview 1, November 13th 2006). Generally CTs were delighted with student teachers who freed them up from their teaching: *"a student teacher, great...five free classes a week...leave them off and see how it goes"* (CT, Joan, Interview 1, November 13th 2006). Joan cited one example of a CT who was very selfish and in order to have half days on Fridays gave *"PETE student [their] classes on Friday afternoon"* (CT, Joan, Interview 1, November 13th 2006).

Joan described Edel as *"very creative and co-operative"* and thought that Edel *"slipped in easily, that it was a massive jump, huge to come into the school"*. (CT, Joan, Interview 1, November 13th 2006). Joan cited an example of Edel's approach to teaching one particular group:

> *They are a quite challenging class. They respond very well to her because the variety of tasks that she does is very good. She tries very well to keep them motivated. They are very very lively, yet they like PE, which is a good thing. So if she can make it interesting, they will work with her* (CT, Joan, Interview 2, December 11th 2006).

Joan, in the last interview, commented on the intensity of Edel's learning progress and how the quality and quantity of her mentoring had changed over TP:

> *Compared to last September, I don't give her the same guidance. She doesn't...she doesn't ask half as many questions. Because she knows herself what she has to do...she is much more autonomous* (CT, Joan, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

In Joan's opinion, Edel was always very responsive to CT feedback:

> *She is eager to find out how she can improve. She wants the feedback. She is not just happy to go away and do it. She loves the feedback. She benefits from it as well. She has no problem with people watching her or she has no problem asking questions* (CT, Joan, Interview 2, December 11th 2006).

As a result, Joan told Edel that she "*loved working with her...that she was an amazing bit of stuff*". She did not think that Edel was aware of it though "*that's the problem*" (CT, Joan, Interview 2, December 11th 2006).

In addition, Joan said that she envied Edel's disposition toward teaching:

> *Myself and the other PE teachers were going, oh my God, I would love to have her enthusiasm. Because you just lose it over a period of time...that you are going in and you are ....you are kind of doing the same drills and the same ideas over and over again* (CT, Joan, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

When asked about where Edel was learning such a variety of PCK, Joan cited soccer as an example:

> *I was saying where do you get all these ideas from? Because she has a soccer background I was thinking she did so much soccer. But she said no that some of it was in College and she looks at books and the Internet to find little games* (CT, Joan, Interview 2, December 11th 2006).

When queried on whether CTs should have a role in PETE student assessment, Joan said that they "*definitely should have a role - definitely have some say in student assessment*" (CT, Joan, Interview 1, November 13th 2006).

(b) The relationship between Edel (PETE student) and Claire (UT)

Edel found the post lesson appraisal form, designed by Claire to help Joan's observation of lessons, very useful. It appeared to have two clear purposes: as a record of the lesson and fodder for post lesson feedback. Joan gave very structured feedback to Edel, using this form: *"looking back on maybe the positive aspects and negative, so constructive and so, it was very handy"* (PETE student, Edel, Interview 1, November 13th 2006). In addition, as stated earlier, Edel used this form as a prompt for her post lesson reflections:

> *As I am doin' my post lesson appraisals, I've been able to think back and look at what they have said and my own personal opinions, so I can work towards it for the next lesson (PETE student, Edel, Interview 1, November 13th 2006).*

It seemed that Edel was surprised at how helpful Claire had been. Edel was not expecting this, and had hoped that Claire would be *"that supportive because you know all the supervisors can be a bit this way or that way"* (PETE student, Edel, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

(c) Edel (PETE student) – Mr. Noonan (SP)

Mr. Noonan was disappointed with the calibre of student teacher graduating from Greendale University:

> *It has been a bit of a problem in my view. We are getting good practitioners in general in education. People are able to deliver the goods, they are able to go in and they will teach the classes well. But they are lacking the type of fire in their belly that...that 10%...that maybe that people of maybe our generation would have had. Because they were more vocational.... I hate to use the word. But I think there was more of a vocational* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. Noonan noticed that the newer graduates *"wanted first of all to be promoted very quickly..."* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). Subsequently, he added that:

> *They don't have the emotional intelligence [for example] they don't understand about for instance how to deal with a parent's difficulty or even how to deal with Principals or Deputy Principals* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. Noonan felt that graduate teachers were preoccupied with pay concerns:

> *Like you know they will be very quick to come in and they will say, oh what about that period I did last week, you know, will I claim for that? It's all about the claiming and the this and the that* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

This was in direct contrast, he believed to the graduates of his era:

> *And you know, I remember when I started...and I am sure you are the same, sure I couldn't do enough subbing and everything for the Principal. That's before we were*

paid for it at all...you had to work to earn your stripes (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

With regard to employing Edel, Mr. Noonan wondered about her combination of PE and SPHE as teaching subjects and said that *"most Principals would prefer them to have another subject"* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview 1, February 16th 2007) in addition to PE. As noted earlier, SPHE or Social Personal and Health Education is a compulsory non-examination Junior Cycle subject, taught for one class period per week in Secondary School. Furthermore, he said:

With all due respect to SPHE, it's very much lower down the priorities for most Principals. People are doing all sorts of shenanigans to even fit it into their timetable at all. And I would think that SPHE, I am afraid, is a filler (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Mr. Noonan felt the only answer was to demand that Brightwater University amended their undergraduate degree content:

Pressure should be put on Brightwater University to get their act together to provide a second subject, a decent subject at the undergraduate level (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

He explained why he felt so strongly about this issue:

I am loathed to have a teacher, a physical education teacher particularly, and it's not just physical education....it applies to career guidance, it applies to a few others as well, that they become such a specialist that they do nothing else. Because I think it is not good for the subject, it is not good for the kids; it is not good for their own professional development (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

This was because Mr. Noonan believed that eventually the PE teacher would become burnt out with the level of activity required of them and this would impact on pupil learning:

Maybe when they get older or otherwise, and they may start getting burnt out, and it's great to know that they have another subject. They might not have to give up PE but that they might maybe ease off on it. I mean ...you know, I am sure it must be very difficult to be teaching PE in your 50s like (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

(d) The relationship between Joan (CT) and Mr. Noonan (SP)

Mr. Noonan, when referring to training Joan (CT) as a Mentor said *"it's just difficult to keep pulling and dragging out of the same pool, you know"* (SP, Mr.

Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). It was difficult to release effective teachers into Mentor training as they were hard to replace because such teachers are *"very effective, good teachers as well. And they are...they are a bigger loss to you."* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). He held Joan in high esteem but worried that she might become complacent in her job: "*Joan is great like you know, I have big time for Joan but PE was a subject where you could fall into that pattern or you could get lazy*" (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). He said that for the last two years: "*Joan has been working nearly exclusively on physical education*" (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). Mr. Noonan then said:

> *Well actually we are taking steps....this year now she will be teaching mainstream English. And we will try and work around that. Because I am anxious for her to have that. She...she wants...she is happy to do that as well* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Summary

Edel was very enthusiastic about TP and would go to any lengths to gain PCK, from relevant UTs, books and the Internet. As TP progresses, Edel demanded less and less input from her CTs, Joan and Trevor. Edel felt that Joan is not very interested in PE and was delighted that she was taking over her PE classes. Edel also found that Joan's learning support diminished as TP progresed and that she turned increasingly to Trevor for more critical feedback.

Claire (UT) was very anxious to work collaboratively with the CTs. She identified that CTs were sometimes unsure of criteria for observation and designed a critique to help solve this.

Even though Joan appeared to be *"in a rut"* (CT, Joan, Interview 1, November 13th 2006) she was very helpful to Edel and used Claire's post lesson observation sheet to guide her feedback. She was envious of Edel's energy and enthusiasm for teaching.

Mr. Noonan thought that the University undervalued the school's role on TP and was very unhappy about this. He added that he thought Principals and

CTs should jointly consult with UTs on the PETE student's TP grade. He contended that Principals should also be involved in delivery of some of the ITE programme as they could illustrate the nature of schooling in a more tangible manner. In his opinion, it was imperative to give schools and their Principals a more central role on TP as they were the ultimate employers of these student teachers.

In chapters Twelve, Thirteen and Fourteen, the three major findings of this study will be reported in detail, referencing the pertinent literature to ensure that the variables identified are theoretically robust (Kirk & Miller, 1986). The three themes inherent in the five case studies reported, offer a compelling insight into the ways in which PETE students experience learning on TP:

Theme One: The role of the cooperating teacher (CT) in supporting PETE student professional learning [Chapter Twelve].

Theme Two: The school-university relationship [Chapter Thirteen].

Theme Three: The overt and hidden curriculum of TP [Chapter Fourteen].

Chapter Twelve: Theme One - The Role of the Cooperating Teacher in Supporting PETE student Professional Learning:

Introduction

This chapter draws together data reported in the five case reports in order to discuss and analyse:

Theme One: the role of the CT in supporting PETE student professional learning on TP.

In so doing, it answers part of the following research question: *Main Research Question 2:* How do teacher-mentors and university tutors view their roles and the nature of learning within the current model of TP supervision?

International literature in the area of mentoring in teacher education suggests that that the mentor plays a pivotal role in supporting pre-service teacher learning during Initial Teacher Education (ITE). Behets & Vergauwen (2006) found that of all teacher educators, CTs have the most significant influence on PETE students as the mentor scaffolds learning by co-planning and co-teaching (Feiman-Nemser & Parker, 1993; McCaughtry & Rovegno, 2003). In their research, McCaughtry et al (2005) asserted that mentees believed that mentors played a major role in helping them to enter the profession and that this perception was linked to a strong increase in psychosocial dynamics in the mentor-mentee relationship. Indeed, in Coleman and Mitchell's (2000) study, the mentor influence was so strong that the teaching behaviours of the PETE students reflected the methods used by the CTs rather than the methods taught in the PETE ITE programme. As stated earlier in Chapter Five, Cothran et al (2008) asserted that CTs must have suitable content knowledge and be effective communicators. Clearly, CTs must be formally trained to fulfill their traditional role of mentor: wise and trusted guide; supporter and advisor (Hardy, 1999; McCaughtry et al., 2005). In short, all of these studies attest to the importance of the quality of the mentor-mentee relationship and its impact on PETE student learning.

Findings in this study corroborate the findings of the studies reported in the wider literature, indicating that PETE student learning on TP is deeply affected by the quality of the CT-PETE student relationship. For example, this study has found that the quality of the CT-PETE student relationship is impacted by:

1. **CTs' teaching expertise**: Cooperating teachers bring pedagogical content knowledge gained from their experience as practitioners. (McCullick, 2001)
2. **CTs' career dispositions**: Huberman (1989) framed the career stages in terms of teachers' individual behaviours and beliefs; the latter is not only about teachers and their work, but is also about pupils, other teachers and work environments.
3. **CTs' mentoring expertise**: The critical role by cooperating teachers, as mentors, should involve serious selection and training (Hardy, 1999; Kiely, 2005).
4. **Compatibility of the CT and PETE student:**

   Where there is compatibility between mentor and protégé there is the potential for substantial and often rapid professional growth. Where there are disparities in personal outlook or professional principles, then the benefits may be limited (Bush, Coleman, Watt, & West-Burnam, 1996, p.122).

The findings relating to this theme are reported, using these four key aspects.

CTs' Teaching Expertise and Career Dispositions

Generally, 'expertise' is understood as outstanding performance built on knowledge gained through sustained practice and experience (Tennant & Pogson, 1995). The dictionary definition of 'disposition' refers to a habit, a preparation, a state of readiness, or a tendency to act in a specified way. CTs' teaching expertise and career dispositions are inextricably linked in Huberman's 'Career Lifecycle' (1989). Here, CTs' dispositions toward their teaching career are captured within a sequential framework which shows that teachers develop differently and have different attitudes, knowledge, skills, and behaviors at various points during their career which are dependent on social and maturational factors (Sprinthall, Reiman, & Thies-Sprinthall, 1996). This has been discussed in more detail in Chapter Three. The table below depicts the phases in the Huberman's Career Lifecycle (1989) and shows

where each CT in this study is positioned relative to teaching expertise and career disposition.

Teaching expertise [measured in years]	Huberman's Career lifecycle phase	CT position
1-3 years	**Career entry:** Painful or easy beginnings; survival, discovery, reality shock.	Michael
4-6 years	**Stabilisation:** Taking on adult responsibilities; making a commitment to a defined professional goal; giving up other options.	John
7-18 years	**Experimentation/Activism:** Experimenting with different materials, student groupings, sequencing; attempts to make institutional changes.	Anita
7-18 years	**Reassessment/Self-doubts:** A growing sense of monotony thoughts of leaving teaching; realising that other careers will have to be ruled out if they do not move quickly.	Joan
19-30 years	**Serenity/Relational Distance:** More mechanical, relaxed, self-accepting.	
19-30 years	**Conservatism:** Resistance to innovation, nostalgia for the past; concern with holding on to what one has rather than with getting what one wants.	Louise
31-40 years	**Disengagement:** Disengaging from investment in work; serene or bitter.	

Table 7: CT Professional Career Cycle (Huberman, 1989)

It is interesting to note that in this study, the five CTs were at different phases of Huberman's Career lifecycle (1989). In the following section, an analysis of the impact of the CT position in the Career Lifecycle upon the quality of CT-PETE student relationship is undertaken, with interesting results.

Michael had been teaching for three years and had supervised PETE students since he began teaching. During this study he was, therefore, in the 'Career Entry' phase of his career lifecycle (Huberman, 1989). The 'Career Entry' phase is a phase when the novice teacher is preoccupied with surviving the early classroom experiences (McCormick & Barnett, 2006), is constantly discovering new territory and experiences moments of 'reality shock' (Stroot, Faucette, & Schwager, 1993) as s/he is confronted with the complexities of teaching. During this phase, Fuller (1969) argued that the novice teacher is moving from (i) concerns about self to (ii) concerns about tasks to (iii) concerns about students and the impact of teaching. Indeed, Odell (1990) asserts that teachers in this phase need to be mentored closely themselves to overcome difficulties encountered as a beginning teacher. This implies that Michael, at 'Career Entry' phase, was certainly not best positioned to mentor the PETE student, Carol.

John had been teaching PE for five years and was in Huberman's (1989) 'Stabilisation Phase' where *"one is now a teacher, both in one's own eyes and in the eyes of others – not necessarily forever, but for a good block of time"* (Huberman, 1989, p.350). In this phase, it is argued that teachers become more comfortable with viewing themselves as professionals because they are no longer considered neophytes and expectations of their performance have increased (McCormick & Barnett, 2006). John appeared enthusiastic about his teaching role and described an effective teacher as a competent and accessible teacher who *"should be available, give advice but would not sort out the problem for the PETE student"* (CT, John, Interview 1, October 9th 2006).

In Huberman's terms, John, was at an optimum phase in his career and appeared to be an appropriate mentor for the PETE student, Barbara.

Anita, with seven years teaching experience, was at the

'Experimentation/Activism phase', (Huberman, 1989) where a teacher, having mastered the classroom (McCormick & Barnett, 2006) may be ready for new challenges, such as becoming a mentor, in order to avoid the risk of going stale in their profession (Huberman, 1989). There is also a drive at this stage to increase their impact on the school which can lead to self-actualisation (Maslow, 1971) and career promotion (issues already discussed in-depth in Chapter Three). Anita appeared to be invigorated by teaching and she endeavoured to deliver a high quality PE programme. Her mentoring style was collaborative in nature (Rikard & Veale, 1996). Anita had both the teaching expertise and the career disposition to mentor her PETE student Dara effectively.

Even though Joan was in the same Huberman year category as Anita, having taught for ten years, Joan appears to be at the other end of the continuum in the 'Reassessment/Self-doubt phase' which is characterised by a *"growing sense of monotony"* (Huberman, 1989). The stocktaking and introspection sometimes found at mid-career during this phase can be akin to a 'mid-life crisis' (McCormick & Barnett, 2006). Huberman argued that this is a stage in which self-doubts can lead to a sense of lack of control, aptly described by one teacher: *"I wondered if I was doomed to die in front of a blackboard with a piece of chalk in my hand"* (Huberman, 1989, p.352). In this study, Joan claimed that she was at a difficult time in her career, that she suffered from *"tiredness and lack of motivation"* and described teaching PE as being very laboursome and reporting that it *"can become mundane over a period of time"* (CT, Joan, Questionnaire, September 2006). She began to envy her PETE student Edel's drive and enthusiasm. Joan did feel that her liaison with Edel invigorated her teaching giving her a renewed impetus in her PE teaching creating some 'midlife generativity' (Erikson, 1963). Generating this renewed energy may have been difficult for Joan, as it appeared that, in some ways Joan was already in 'a rut'; as noted by her School Principal, Mr. Noonan, who argued that as Joan had been teaching PE exclusively, which was not an examination subject, she might become complacent and lazy. To remedy this, he had included Leaving Certificate English on her timetable for the next academic year. Clearly, it is a risky learning strategy to link PETE students with CTs who are 'in a rut' in their teaching.

Louise (CT) had 26 years PE teaching experience and so was at Huberman's (1989) 'Conservatism Phase'. This phase is embedded in beliefs that standards are dropping: in pupil behaviours and PETE student behaviours, and displays a conservative view of teaching (McCormick & Barnett, 2006). Mr. Kelly thought that Louise was *"just coasting"* (SP, Mr. Kelly, Interview Principal, February 13th 2007). In addition, Louise displayed a resistance to innovation and believed that the PCK she had learned at university was still valid, thereby displaying a nostalgia for the past. Louise placed a high value on maintaining the status quo in her PE classes and was reluctant to embrace change. To this end, she had avoided In-service training for most of her career, but had been coerced into attending one recently, because of a DES Inspection. It could be argued that a CT who is stagnant in her career and who is closed to change will find it difficult to mentor a PETE student effectively.

If mentors were selected only on the basis of teaching expertise, which is measured in relation to length of service, the assumption would be that four out of five CTs in this study, were suitable mentors. However, what this research illustrates is that there is much more to be taken into consideration because both teaching expertise and career disposition affect the ability of a CT to mentor effectively. Based on this premise, it could be argued from the data that just one CT, Anita, had both the teaching expertise and positive disposition required to mentor her PETE student. This corroborates Tannehill and Goc-Carp's (1992) conclusion that teaching expertise, alone, is not always an effective measure of mentor suitability. It follows from this, that the critical role of CTs as mentors should involve earnest selection and training (Hardy, 1999; Kiely, 2005) and such selection must, at the very least, be based on teacher expertise and career disposition. Moreover, once selected, it can be argued that CTs should be trained formally to act as mentors. The findings on mentor training from the case studies in this research certainly point to a need for training.

CT Mentoring Expertise

The effective placement of PETE students in schools is one of the core aspects of teacher preparation but it has been argued that, too often, schools

are selected based on convenience rather than any other consideration (McIntyre et al., 1996). This is certainly the case in Ireland, where TP schools are selected by the central TP Office at Greendale University and not by the PESS and EPS department tutors. The main selection criteria for TP schools are: (a) school principal willingness to accommodate a student at his/her school and (b) school distance from the university (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007). Clearly, there could be other important criteria taken into consideration; for example, it could be argued that TP schools must be selected on the basis of CT suitability as mentors (Fletcher, 1998). As stated earlier in this chapter, CTs in Ireland are untrained as mentors. So, in short, the Irish TP system is wholly inadequate, as CTs act as untrained mentors, who happen to be in a school that is available and convenient to the university. This could be described as a very haphazard TP situation which is effectively a lottery for student learning.

As was explained earlier, all five CTs in this study were thrust into mentoring PETE students without formal training. The only mentoring experience that the CTs in this study had, therefore, was that of being mentored themselves as PETE students. Stroot et al (1993) use the term 'washout effect' to describe a process whereby in the absence of formal mentor training, these CTs simply reverted to what they knew.

Example One: Case Study - Edel

For example, Joan's (CT) personal experience as a PETE student was of a 'mentor' who was rarely present and did not give feedback. In her subsequent role as a CT, comments by Edel, Joan's PETE student, suggest that Joan reproduced her personal experience, treating Edel in the same manner, on occasion.

Example Two: Case Study - Dara

The above scenario was in direct contrast to Anita who had trained in UK where mentoring is an established part of teacher training. This experience resulted in Anita having a very different approach to the role of CT, where she always had pre and post lesson conferences with Dara, during which Dara's preparation and practice would be scrutinised.

Example Three: Case Study - Barbara

John was a CT who believed that perhaps mentors in Ireland don't need specific training; that they know enough already. He equated teaching expertise with the ability to mentor. Tannehill & Goc-Carp (1992) assert that teaching expertise is not always an effective measure of mentoring capability. However, John also had ideas about the kind of training that might be useful, but much of it could be described as instrumental e.g. teaching ideas. There was little evidence, for example, that he was seeking challenging learning in the sense that some of the earlier theoretical discussion on learning theories in Chapter Two seems to suggest, is desirable.

Clearly, in the absence of formal mentor training, these CTs reverted to their own experience of being mentored, whether positive or negative, and re-enacted this mentoring style with their PETE student. Having had a very positive experience of being mentored, Anita was the only CT who appeared to use the mentoring skills of guidance, facilitation, trust and support, as outlined in Chapter Three. However, in this study, while it was evident that teaching expertise, career disposition and mentor training were important ingredients in the mentor-mentee relationship, there was also evidence that issues of PETE student-CT compatibility also impacted on PETE student learning.

Compatibility of CT and PETE student

As explained in Chapter Three, in ecological theory, human relationships are developed through person-environment exchanges where the ability of an organism to thrive in an environment is linked to the 'goodness of fit' between the person and the environment, the satisfaction of mutual needs, ability to cope, to deal with stressors and the availability of supports (Germain & Gitterman, 1987). If this theory is extrapolated to this research, it could be argued that in order for the mentor-mentee relationship to thrive, there should also be a 'goodness of fit' (ibid) between mentor and mentee. There is evidence from this study that all PETE students (mentees) searched for a 'goodness of fit' with their CT (mentor) and if this was untenable, they actively sought a surrogate mentor who had a better 'goodness of fit' (ibid).

In one case, in spite of the random process of selection, there appeared to be a 'goodness of fit' (Germain & Gitterman, 1987) between Anita (CT) and Dara (PETE student). Dara admired Anita's professionalism: her preparation for class, her resources, her enthusiasm and her demeanour, her willingness to help. These attributes were identified by Malderez et al (2007) as functional aspects of a positive mentoring relationship. However, for four PETE students, Aoife, Barbara, Carol and Edel, the relationship between themselves and their CT was less than positive, leading to a breakdown in the mentoring relationship (Cameron & Jesser, 1992; Gerstein, 1985). The reasons for this collapse appeared very similar to those found by Hunt & Michael (1983): loss of self-esteem, frustration, blocked opportunity and a sense of betrayal experienced by the PETE student. In addition, there appeared to be a lack of commitment by the CT, which undermined the success of the mentor-mentee relationship (Cameron & Jesser, 1992; Garrat, 1990; Malderez et al., 2007). While Aoife and Carol relied on their own resources to extricate themselves from this predicament, Barbara and Edel actively sought and found a surrogate mentor in the TP school (Malderez et al., 2007) who appeared to have a 'goodness of fit' (Germain & Gitterman, 1987) with their personality, teaching ideals and ambitions. Barbara began to work with Laura who, unlike John was *"easy to talk to"*, *"really nice and bubbly"* and seemed to *"go out of her way"* to help Barbara (PETE student, Barbara, Interview, 3, February 12th 2007). Edel relied on Trevor who, unlike Joan, was very vigilant in his post lesson feedback. There appeared to be a desire by these PETE students not only to survive in the face of adversity, but to triumph in these circumstances by taking control in the mentor-mentee relationship, leading to something of a power-shift between the CT and the PETE student.

Power Shift between CT and PETE student

The lack of mentor training identified in these cases coupled with poor compatibility between CT and PETE student, resulted in an interesting phenomenon that has been identified in previous research: a power-shift in the mentor-mentee relationship (Otto, 1994). In Chapter Three, it was argued that mentoring is not an "apolitical act" (Gulam & Zulfiqar, 1998) being

inherently bounded within power relationships (Devos, 2004; Manathunga, 2007; O'Leary & Mitchell, 1990; Wunsch, 1994). Ayers and Griffin (2005) highlighted the need for future research to investigate the dynamics of power on the mentor and mentee. This study attempts to do this by addressing the nature and impact of this power-shift on the mentoring relationship on TP I.e. its impact on PETE learning.

The findings in this study support these views because within all five cases, there appeared to be a power struggle underway between the CT (mentor) and the PETE student (mentee). It could be argued that this struggle was instigated by PETE students who appeared to want to take charge of their own learning. PETE students seemed to feel that CTs were not sufficiently available to guide their learning and that, at times, the CT's feedback was superficial, repetitive or irrelevant i.e. focusing solely on classroom management issues rather than on pupil learning progression. As outlined in Chapter Three, typically the mentoring relationship is viewed as hierarchical, where the mentee is subordinate (Danielson, 2002) however in the cases in this study, it was the mentor who eventually, took the subordinate role. There are numerous examples of this shift in power in the data.

Example One: Case Study - Dara

In one example, Dara had identified a 'goodness of fit' (Germain & Gitterman, 1987) with Anita but, as TP progressed, she began to feel that she no longer needed Anita's help, *"I felt that like there was no point in her doing it all the time"* (PETE student, Dara Interview 3, February 16th 2007). This may be because Dara felt that Anita was no longer able to challenge her and she was *"able to...do you know, just take off my own"* (PETE student, Dara Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

Example Two: Case Study - Edel

A second PETE student, Edel, seemed to have the same view and explained that she felt she did not need extensive learning support from Joan, because she might have been a nuisance. She believed that the time had come for her to become more autonomous and *"kind of go out on her own and learn on her own"* (PETE student, Edel, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

Example Three: Case Study - Aoife

A third PETE student, Aoife, initially, had a very interesting view of the mentor as someone who was sensitive to the situation and would only step in when it was necessary. Fundamentally the mentor was there to *"assist her"* in the development of ideas on TP. Therefore, at the beginning of her school placement, Aoife was very open to the *"idea of her [Louise] coming in at any stage if she wishes"* (PETE student, Aoife, Interview 1, October 23rd 2006). In practice, Louise did not do this and, as TP continued, Aoife began to become frustrated that help was not forthcoming. She contemplated the idea of demanding that Louise sit in and observe classes, even though she decided against this course of action in the end. Aoife was afraid, however, that if she demanded learning support from Louise it might open the proverbial 'floodgates' and Louise's support might become 'claustrophobic', if Aoife felt that she was continuously assessed. Clearly, the nature of the mentoring relationship had changed over time and Aoife now felt that too much mentoring would be threatening, perhaps echoing Long's (1997) view that *"when imposed mentoring loses its spontaneity and its intrinsically non-judgemental value, it runs the risk of becoming another form of assessment for the mentee"* (p.129). Interestingly, throughout this deliberation, it was clear that Aoife did realise she needed learning support from her CT to progress but this guidance appeared to be required by Aoife, on Aoife's terms.

Example Four: Case Study - Carol

Carol's relationship with her CT, Michael, was fractious and it was clear that there was an absence of 'goodness of fit' (Germain & Gitterman, 1987). The main reason for this was that Michael's post lesson feedback was continuously negative and very didactic in style (Rikard & Veale, 1996). On the advice of two Greendale university tutors, Carol decided to confront

Michael to tell him how she was feeling. Rather than discussing the issue and reaching a compromise, Michael immediately suggested passing over the mentoring responsibility to his colleague, Martha. It became clear that Michael was unwilling to accept Carol's criticism of his feedback. This might have been because he felt that he was justified in his criticism, as, to him, Carol was "unmotivated" and had very little PCK compared to previous Greendale PETE students. This finding matches that identified by Kay (2004) who found that mentors were not empathic toward PETE students who did not have adequate PCK. It was also evident that Michael did not see that his function was to up-skill Carol's PCK. This had a detrimental effect on Carol who became very distressed and could not sleep. Eventually, Carol began to exert control over her own learning. She appeared to want to gain her teaching qualification and began to plan lessons more carefully referring to books and websites. As a result she began to feel better about TP. Even though Michael had effectively abandoned Carol, he did observe that TP had "*been kind of a bit of a rough ride for her really*" (CT, Michael Interview 3, February 16th 2007). It was clear that he did not want to help her and that he had a complete lack of empathy for her predicament.

Example Five: Case Study - Barbara

Barbara, a fifth PETE student was adamant throughout TP that she "*just wants ideas*" from her CT, John. This is similar to Cothran et al's (2008) findings where PETE students wanted 'quick fix' solutions to their problems. What was interesting here, though, was that Barbara did not want John to observe classes as she felt it would be too pressurised. The quick-fix solutions, therefore, could only be provided by John in response to Barbara's perceived, classroom difficulties. This arrangement seemed to suit John, who rarely observed classes. When Barbara sought guidance from John, she found it difficult to communicate with him, as he seemed shy and quiet. As said earlier, she found it easier to relate to Laura, the other CT.

Initially, glancing at these five examples, it seems that just one of the PETE students, Dara, was compatible with her mentor. However, on closer inspection, even Dara's relationship weakened with her mentor, once it became evident that that the mentor was unable to challenge her to learn.

The other four PETE students appeared to be poorly matched with their mentors from the outset of TP, on the basis of both disposition and mentoring expertise, and so they felt unsupported and unchallenged by their mentor. This forces PETE students to take charge of their own learning very early in their TP. While autonomy is a laudable mentee characteristic (Claxton, 1999), it should be developed in a supportive mentor-mentee relationship and not thrust upon the mentee as a desperate measure. Undoubtedly, the issues raised in these cases had implications for the nature and quality of PETE student learning on TP, and this is discussed in detail in Chapter Fourteen.

Conclusion

This chapter answered part of the following research question:

Main Research Question 2: How do teacher-mentors and university tutors view their roles and the nature of learning within the current model of TP supervision?

The findings of this study provide compelling evidence that PETE students were not supported to learn effectively by CTs during TP. In so doing, these findings offer strong evidence that CTs in Ireland should be selected carefully to be mentors on the basis of both teaching expertise and career disposition. Once selected, CTs would benefit from specialised training to become mentors who can engage with PETE students and challenge them to make progress in their learning. In the cases illustrated in this research, where formal mentor training did not exist, CTs reverted to and re-enacted the mentoring that they experienced as PETE students. Hence, in this research, the PETE students learned to survive TP by:

(i) Becoming an 'à la carte mentee', taking charge of the mentor-mentee relationship and commandeering the TP experience by deciding how, when and by whom to be mentored which led to...

(ii) Learning PCK in a variety of ways; sometimes from a CT but more often from self-selected mentors or sources such as books and Internet sites.

These issues will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter and it could be argued that the situation found in these five cases is far from ideal in terms

of supporting student learning. If the education system is intended to be designed around the needs of the pupil, then perhaps it should also be the case that ITE (and as part of that, TP) should be designed around the needs of the PETE student (Armour et al., 2007) where 'teachers matter' (Cochran-Smith, 2005). With no formal selection or training of mentors in Ireland, CTs and PETE students are placed in an untenable situation where mentoring is both haphazard and unregulated. Chapter Thirteen, the next chapter, reports on findings related to the relationships between the school and university and how these promote PETE student learning on TP.

Chapter Thirteen: Theme Two - School-University Relationship

Introduction

This chapter collates data reported from the five case studies, in order to analyse and discuss the second theme: The relationships between school and university and how they support PETE student professional learning. This theme answers the following research questions:

> *Main Research Question 1*: How are PETE students supported to learn effectively during TP within the existing partnership model?
> And part of this research question:
> *Main Research Question 2:* How do teacher-mentors and university tutors view their roles and the nature of learning within the current model of TP supervision?

As outlined in Chapter Four, effective ITE programmes possess a range of key characteristics, one of which is placing value on the strength of the school-university relationship in supporting PETE student learning (Darling-Hammond, 2006b). International studies identify ways that school and university personnel should clearly understand and fulfil their respective roles, thus delivering a shared, logical programme of teacher education (Hardy, 1999; Kiely, 2005; McIntyre et al., 1996). A pivotal aspect of ITE is TP, with the school as the major worksite for the school-university partnership (Behets & Vergauwen, 2006, p.407-408).

Within TP, traditionally, the fundamental operational triad comprises the PETE student, the cooperating teacher (CT) and university tutor (UT), and this represents the 'school-university partnership'. Each member brings a different experience to the triad: the PETE student has recent experience of participating in second level PE classes and, most recently, the university degree programme, the CT has, in addition to these (more distant) experiences, enhanced PCK from teaching expertise; and the UT has further knowledge gained from teaching and research (McCullick, 2001). It is important to note that, in these case studies, neither the CT nor the UT, had

been trained for their respective roles in TP. In this research, the role of the school principal (SP) in supporting PETE student learning was also explored. Thus, the traditional triad became a tetrad of SP, CT, UT and PETE student. This chapter analyses and discusses how school and university representatives, in these tetrads, nurtured PETE student learning of PCK.

According to Callahan & Martin (2007), since the 1980s, school-university partnerships have become a stronghold of teacher education programmes. The etymology of the term *partnership*, in the commercial sense, was first mooted circa 1700, pointing to a shared ownership of an entity (Wordnet, 2008a). Today, the term 'partnership' has grown to encompass other meanings, one of which describes it as a:

> *Cooperative relationship between people or groups who agree to share responsibility for achieving some specific goal* (ibid).

It is this definition that underpins the notion of school-university partnerships. Such partnerships may be defined in terms of their (a) interaction preferences (Day, 1998) or (b) goals (Teitel, 1999). With regard to 'interaction preferences', Day (1998) suggests that school-university partnerships may be categorised according to three types of interaction: ideology (the search for like minds), generativity (the search to produce new knowledge), or capacity-building (the search to create change through sustained interaction). Alternatively, Teitel (1999) suggests that school-university partnerships may be defined by four key goals:

(a) Improvement of student [pupil] learning;

(b) Preparation of educators;

(c) Professional development of educators;

(d) Research and inquiry into improving practice.

These four goals place adult learning at the centre of the school-university partnership (Sandholtz, 2002). In Ireland, as has been noted before, there was no formal partnership between the school and the university in ITE and this is an important contextual factor in understanding the data from this research.

Findings from this research share many similarities with those from international studies and indicate that PETE student learning of PCK is

profoundly impacted by the quality of the school-university relationship (Darling-Hammond, 2006b; Hardy, 1999; McIntyre et al., 1996). In summary, this study has found that the quality of the school-university relationship was affected by:

1. **UT tutoring expertise**: UTs needed credibility as practitioners when training teachers to teach it was felt they should have recent, current and longitudinal knowledge of teaching so that, echoing McCullick (2001) they *"know what they were talking about"* (p.43).
2. **UT tutoring disposition**: It was felt that UTs should exhibit a *"love for their subject matter"* (McCullick, 2001, p.44).
3. **The UT and CT relationship:** Was ideally depicted as having:
   Strong relationships, common knowledge, and shared beliefs among school and university-based faculty jointly engaged in transforming teaching, schooling and teacher education (Darling-Hammond, 2006b, p.305)
4. **University and school relationship:** In particular there was a need indicated for each party to value the others' contributions, leading to parity of esteem between the school and university (Graham, 1988).

Using these four factors, the findings in relation to the quality of the school-university partnership are now interrogated and discussed in detail.

UT Tutoring Expertise and Tutoring Disposition

In Ireland, university faculty in teacher education fulfil three roles: lecturer, researcher and tutor. Acting as a tutor, the faculty member fulfils a TP supervisory role acting as both advisor and assessor to the student teacher. A PETE student is typically assigned a PE tutor and an Education tutor during TP. Faculty members are untrained for their role in TP tutoring. If located in the PESS department, the UT specialises in PE tutoring. If members of the EPS, the tutors specialise in Education theory and, based on degree qualifications, may also have expertise in tutoring a particular discipline e.g. English, Geography, Irish, Maths, Science, or Business Studies. Within the Grad Dip the PETE student was assigned two tutors, one from the PESS department and one from the EPS department. Both were expected to show expertise in PE teaching. Three of the UTs mentioned in this study, Claire, Noelle and Liz, were PE UTs from the PESS department and three, Nigel, Sinead and Lillian, were UTs located at the EPS department. All of these UTs supervised and assessed PETE students on TP.

In organizing this section, Huberman's (1989) Career cycle model has once again been borrowed and adapted in order to evaluate UT PETE tutoring expertise and disposition for this work. As outlined in Chapter Twelve, 'expertise' is understood as outstanding performance built on knowledge gained through sustained practice and experience (Tennant & Pogson, 1995). 'Disposition' is defined as a habit, a preparation, a state of readiness, or a tendency to act in a specified way. It appeared in this research that UT PE tutoring expertise and disposition toward PE tutoring were inextricably linked.

Using Huberman's (1989) framework, UTs' dispositions toward their PE tutoring work were captured within a sequential cycle which showed that UTs developed differently. For example, UTs had a range of attitudes, knowledge, skills, and behaviors at various points during their tutoring career which were influenced by social and maturational factors (Sprinthall et al., 1996).

The table below, locates each UT in this study and identifies their position with regard to PE tutoring, expertise and career disposition.

PE Tutoring expertise [measured in years]	**Career lifecycle phase (Huberman)**	**UT position**
1-3 years	**Career entry:** Painful or easy beginnings; survival, discovery, reality shock.	**Lillian (Education UT)**
4-6 years	**Stabilisation:** Taking on adult responsibilities; making a commitment to a defined professional goal; giving up other options.	**Noelle (PE UT)**
7-18 years	**Experimentation/Activism:** Experimenting with different materials, student groupings, sequencing; attempts to make institutional changes.	
7-18 years	**Reassessment/Self-doubts:** A growing sense of monotony thoughts of leaving tutoring; realising that other careers will	

	have to be ruled out if they do not move quickly.	
19-30 years	**Serenity/Relational Distance:** More mechanical, relaxed, self-accepting	**Claire (PE UT)**
19-30 years	**Conservatism:** Resistance to innovation, nostalgia for the past; concern with holding on to what one has rather than with getting what one wants	
31-40 years	**Disengagement:** Disengaging from investment in work; serene or bitter.	**Liz (PE UT)**

Table 8: UT Professional Career Cycle (Huberman, 1989)

It is interesting to note that UTs in this study were at different phases of Huberman's professional Career cycle (Huberman, 1989) and this led to some interesting findings.

Lillian was a novice PE UT, with 0 years experience, and was in the Career Entry phase of Huberman's professional Career cycle (1989). She had been an Education UT in the EPS for a number of years. Dara (PETE student) on TP observed that Lillian appeared to be very unfamiliar with PE PCK and didn't understand what Dara was doing in class. This became very clear in the post lesson discussion when Lillian complimented Dara on the *"hopping and jumping"* in her basketball lesson (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). It seemed very clear that Lillian did not understand the game of basketball or how to teach basketball. Dara was not the only PETE student to have had such an experience with Lillian. Lillian displayed the same lack of PCK in soccer when she expressed concern that a soccer game might be dangerous if pupils were running in different directions. In addition, Lillian showed an obvious lack of understanding of typical PE teacher classroom behaviour when she believed that the PE teacher might be sitting when delivering the class. It was evident that Lillian did not have any expertise in

classroom management and instruction in relation to PE. Ironically, Dara tried to excuse Lillian's lack of expertise, notwithstanding that Lillian was assessing her TP performance. Dara appeared to feel sorry for her predicament. Clearly, Lillian (UT), having no PE PCK, seemed unaware that this might affect her appraisal of Dara's TP performance. Therefore, Lillian did not have credibility as a practitioner and was poorly placed to guide Dara's learning. The 'Career Entry' phase is a phase when the novice UT is preoccupied with surviving (McCormick & Barnett, 2006), is constantly discovering new territory and experiences moments of 'reality shock' (Stroot et al., 1993) as he/she is confronted with the complexities of tutoring. During this phase, Fuller (1969) argues that a concerns-based model may also pertain to UT development where the novice UT is moving from (i) concerns about self to (ii) concerns about tasks to (iii) concerns about students and the impact of teaching. Applying Odell's (1990) theory to UTs, it is clear that UTs in this phase need to be mentored closely themselves to overcome difficulties encountered as a beginning UT. This implied that Lillian, at 'Career Entry' phase, was certainly not best positioned to supervise her PETE student, Dara.

Noelle (UT) was at the 'Stabilisation' phase of the 'career cycle' (Huberman, 1989), with 5 years tutoring experience. She felt insecure about her entry point to teacher education, as she had no PE teaching experience. To counteract this, Noelle worked hard to gain credibility, learning about PE *"on the job"* (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 2007) and using teacher education policy documents, books, journal articles and the Internet to supplement her knowledge. Aoife, PETE student, noticed this and said*"a lot of lecturers are teaching from a book"* (PETE student, Aoife, Focus Group, March 29th 2007). Noelle (UT) did not feel confident in her tutoring role, thinking that she did not have 'credibility as a practitioner' (McCullick, 2001) believing that she was not *"the best placed person to give students feedback in relation to their learning within the school environment"* (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007). In this 'career cycle (Huberman, 1989) phase, it is argued that teachers become more comfortable with viewing themselves as professionals because they are no longer considered neophytes and expectations of their performance have increased (McCormick & Barnett, 2006). This did not seem to be the case for Noelle. In spite of her

five years as UT, Noelle seemed to still feel she was in the Career Entry phase and was centrally concerned with self (Fuller, 1969). An interesting pattern had emerged. In Chapter Twelve, PETE students, in the absence of CT guidance, turned to the Internet and books to supplement PCK. Here, the same practice is evident as the UT adopted the same strategy to learn PCK and earn 'credibility as a practitioner' (McCullick, 2001).

In her career to date, Claire has had a range of roles: PE teacher, researcher and mentor trainer. She has worked as a UT for 28 years and had recently moved back to Ireland to work at Greendale University. Claire was in the 'Serenity/Relational Distance' phase of the Career Cycle (Huberman, 1989) and in line with this phase described herself as *"relatively comfortable"* in her tutoring role (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007). However, she admitted that adjusting to the Irish context had been challenging. Barbara (PETE student) noted that because Claire (UT) had worked outside Ireland, she hadn't grasped the *"Irish context as well. It could be...you know like different in different countries"* (PETE student, Barbara, Focus Group, March 29th 2007).

Liz (UT) had been a PE teacher for five years and a faculty member in the PE Department for the past 35 years. In Huberman's (1989) terms, Liz was in the 'Disengagement' phase of the Career cycle. She described post lesson conferences with CTs and PETE students as almost a battle, with the CT and PETE student on one side and the UT on the other. However, Liz felt that she was on the pupils' 'side'. So, while Liz seemed to have the pupils' interests foremost in her mind, she experienced some frustration working with the PETE students in this study *"as they did not have shared language with tutors"* compared to students on a four year degree programme who were much more *"sophisticated"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006). Liz appeared to be disengaging from her work and perhaps becoming bitter in the process, which is typical of this Career cyle phase (Huberman, 1989). In spite of this, PETE students reported that Liz's tutorials were a rich site of learning:

> *The tutorials that we had with Liz they were very good. Do you know, they kind of brought it down to a lighter note instead of just throwing stuff at us you know* (PETE student, Aoife, Focus Group, March 29th 2007).

Clearly, if UTs had been selected on the basis of PETE tutoring expertise alone (using years of service as a measure of expertise) an assumption would have been made that three out of four UTs in this study would be suitable tutors. However, what this research illustrates is that there is much more to be taken into consideration because *both* tutoring expertise and career disposition affect the ability of a UT to tutor effectively. In reality just one UT, Claire, had both the PE tutoring expertise and the positive disposition required to supervise her PETE student. Claire argued that both CTs and UTs should be trained for their role in TP:

> *I think the training should be both for the teachers in the schools as well as the tutors who do this work. I think it should be seen as both a professional development initiative for those persons themselves as well as an accountability mechanism for the teacher education programme* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

Unsurprisingly, perhaps, three PETE students in this study, Edel, Carol and Dara, made negative comments about the UT PETE tutoring expertise. Edel thought that UTs were out of touch with the reality of schooling: *"I don't know if they truly know what the students are like in the school"* (PETE student, Edel, Focus Group, March 29th 2007). Carol asserted that this was due to lack of experience in tutoring *"Because they haven't been in it in so long maybe you know"* (PETE student, Carol, Focus Group, March 29th 2007). Dara (PETE student) summarised the usefulness of UT PETE tutoring expertise:

> *I think they are all in fairyland. They think it's like... I think I have said it to you before, like they all think it's like... you are going in with these...like 30 perfect students in your class and nothing can go wrong. But like that's not the way it happens at all. And the stuff that...like do you know when you are talking about like how to deal with conflict...conflict or behaviour problems...they come up with these ...oh now if you do this...But if you went into a school and did that you would be laughed out the door. They [pupils] would not listen to you for the rest of the year* (PETE student, Dara, Focus Group, March 29th 2007).

There are echoes in this comment of Graber's (1989) observation

> *Why should [PETE] students believe what teacher educators have to say when those mentors have had little recent contact with the public school and in some cases little credibility as models of excellence in teaching?* (p.74).

These data also support McCullick's (2001) findings that 'credibility as a practitioner' is a highly valued UT quality, by PETE students.

The range of UT PETE tutoring expertise was also noted by SPs. Mr. O'Brien

(SP) was unhappy with the calibre of younger Tutors coming into school to monitor PETE student learning; arguing that *"there was no point being able to talk the talk, you must be able to walk the talk"* (SP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 16th 2007). Mr. O'Brien was referring to the fact that these tutors needed to have 'credibility as practitioners' (McCullick, 2001) Mr. Cotter (SP) also commented about the range of Tutors coming into the school to assess PETE student learning. He noted that the *"range and the diversity of tutors were just enormous"* and he recommended that UTs needed: "*A hell of a lot of training, and opportunities for reflection and learning how to give feedback"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007). Mr. Cotter added that a Tutor needed to be *"a very well developed person"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

Clearly, UTs in this study, had a wide range of PE tutoring expertise and dispositions toward PE tutoring, a point noted by both PETE students and SPs. It was evident that PETE students had little respect for UTs because there were questions about their expertise. In this situation, PETE students felt compelled to learn elsewhere, often from books or the Internet, as outlined in Chapter Twelve. In addition, it was also clear that SPs lacked confidence in UTs, noting that in some cases, UT expertise was lacking and that UTs were untrained for their TP role. It would appear from the data that this lack of respect for university tutors undermined the school-university relationship. This ultimately led to difficulties with respect to the nature and quality of the UT-CT relationship.

UT-CT Relationship: The issue of parity

Tikunoff, Ward & Lazar (1980) cite parity as one of the most important ingredients of successful collaboration. A dictionary definition describes parity as *"equality, as in amount, status or quantity"* (Answers.com, 2008) In this study, parity refers to an 'equality of status' in relation to TP supervision. During TP, school and university personnel need to be equal partners, if the collaboration is going to succeed. Hence, each member of this collaborative project, SP, CT and UT, need to assume a share of responsibility based on his or her ability to participate. This doesn't mean, however, that all members of the project need to have equal abilities. Indeed, an advantage of

collaboration is the opportunity to capitalise on a variety of expertise (Kiely, 2005). In this section, data that indicated issues in the perceived parity of status between UT and CT are analysed in the context of assessment of PETE student learning on TP.

In Ireland, the UT is the only assessor of PETE student learning on TP. The UT and CT may have a post lesson conference about PETE student progress, but the TP grading is ultimately determined by the UT and that PETE students did not have an *"even playing pitch"* when it came to the grading process (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007). Given this structural issue, it was immediately apparent that there was a fundamental lack of parity between the UT and CT in relation to PETE student assessment, and this gave rise to a number of hostile encounters (Trubowitz, 1986) between CTs and UTs. In these instances, CTs defended PETE student performance during the post lesson conference in an effort, perhaps, to have an influence on the Tutor's assessment of PETE student learning:

Example One: Case Study - Dara

In this example, Liz (UT) felt from the outset that Anita (CT) and Dara (PETE student) had a defensive attitude to her arrival. It was clear that they had primed the pupils to behave prior to the lesson. After this particular class, Liz was unhappy with Dara's performance, and thought that Dara was more interested in the pupils having fun, than learning. After a very one-sided conversation, Anita was invited to give her feedback and she immediately defended Dara's teaching implying that Liz was not looking at the all facets of the teaching situation. Liz was unphased by Anita's response as she had found this defensive reaction from the CT, to be the norm in post lesson debriefings. Liz was used to backing down because she found that CTs and PETE students would not accept constructive criticism and were prone to getting aggressive. Clearly, in this example the UT was seen as a kind of enemy, in the face of which the CT needed to defend the PETE student's position.

Example Two: Case Study - Barbara

In this example, directly after a lesson, Barbara (PETE student) commented that she felt that her lesson had been of a reasonable standard, neither good nor bad. Claire (UT) met with Laura (CT) and Barbara after the class and interrogated Laura, the other CT, to ascertain if the class behaviour had been orchestrated, and how Barbara dealt with pupil behaviour in other classes. Laura was vehement in her defence of Barbara and demanded that Barbara should be awarded a good TP grade on the basis of her continued strong performance on TP. Because Laura had shielded her from Claire's comments, Barbara admired Laura, and implied that Laura would defend Barbara regardless of her TP performance. In this example, once more, it appeared as if the PETE student and CT were on one side, while the UT was on the other. Interestingly, in spite of this interaction, Claire (UT) was trying to foster a strong, equal working relationship with CTs:

> *So, in terms of the co-operating teachers, building up a sense of trust with them that, we are actually all in this together and level the playing field* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 2007).

In Claire's (UT) opinion, CT-UT partnership in assessment was the only viable option because the current unilateral mechanism was not credible or robust and that *"if any lawyer wanted to take me apart they could literally take me apart at the moment"* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

Example Three: Case Study - Aoife

In this example, Louise (CT) attempts to offer her opinion to Noelle (UT) on Aoife's (PETE student) learning progress. Louise felt that during this encounter, Noelle was not prepared to listen to her point of view concerning Aoife's clear lack of PCK and was defensive of the university's approach to PCK training. Louise was both angry and disappointed that the university did not want feedback from schools on the Grad Dip programme.

In terms of Noelle (UT) consulting with Louise on Aoife's learning progress, Louise (CT) watched for one lesson and met Noelle afterwards, but the lesson critique was never *"shown to her"* (CT, Louise, Interview 3, February 13th 2007). Here, it appeared that the UT was not interested in the CT's opinion, that to her, it was irrelevant to the assessment process.

To summarise, there is much evidence of open hostility between the CT and UT in this study, which was witnessed by the PETE students. Having experienced this hostility, Claire (UT) explained that perhaps CTs modelled the way in which they had been mentored on TP and the hostility they, too, had witnessed:

> *Hierarchically, sort of...perfectly understandable...looked back at how...how it was done with them [CTs]. And so, if you like, they are trying to model that behaviour* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January, 17th 2007).

Observation of this hostile CT-UT relationship may have copper-fastened the PETE student's perception of the UT as someone who, in spite of having inadequate expertise, remained the omnipotent assessor of TP. This distanced the UT from the PETE student and, thus, may have closed down yet another avenue of learning for the PETE student.

School and University Relationship: Another issue of parity

According to Graham (1988), when collaboration occurs, the barriers between the university and the school often become less formidable with communication levels increasing.

> *Aloofness or a feeling of superiority is a facade that is easy to maintain at a distance, but when people work together successfully, facades disappear. And that is a positive, potential benefit of collaboration* (p. 168).

As was noted earlier, eventually, in effective collaboration, parties come to value each other's contribution which can lead to parity of esteem between the school and university. However the journey towards such parity is precarious, often infused with suspicion and lack of mutual respect. According to Trubowitz (1986) when a school and university collaborate, there are eight key stages which must be traversed: (1) hostility and aggression, (2) lack of trust, (3) period of truce, (4) mixed approval, (5) acceptance, (6) regression, (7) renewal, and (8) continuing progress. Trubowitz (1986) argued that in some cases, the school and university fail to progress past the first two stages and certainly in this research there is evidence that all five schools remained in the first two stages of collaboration. There were a number of reasons for this.

Schools Feeling Superior to University

Similar to the research by Behets & Vergauwen (2006), three school principals in this study believed that the school was the primary site for PETE student learning and so was the superior learning site. Mr. Clancy (SP) commented that the school played a pivotal role in ITE (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). Mr. Cotter held the view that the school was central to ITE (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007). Mr. Noonan (SP) asserted that the PETE student learned more at school than in university (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview, February 16th 2007). In addition, Mr. Noonan (SP) commented that *both* teacher education and pupil learning were the central remits of a school (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview, February 16th 2007).

Universities Exploiting Schools

There was also a feeling expressed by SPs, that universities were exploiting schools. For example, Mr. Noonan (SP) asserted that the system was weighted in favour of the university that the school was *"quite peripheral to the whole affair"* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). As an example of this, Mr. Noonan (SP) described how the university controlled the placement of PETE students without consulting his school. In fact, Mr. Noonan contended that PETE students were assigned to schools on the basis of availability rather than suitability and that there was *"certain desperation...in getting people into places whether they fit or don't fit"* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). Mr. Clancy (SP) concurred and described the university's mechanism of placing PETE students in school as *"a little bit ad hoc...trial and error"* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). This finding supports McIntyre et al's (1996) study which asserted that TP placement was often based on convenience. This had lead to a situation where Mr. Clancy (SP) reported that the university simply assumed that the school would take many PETE students. Mr. Kelly (SP) described facilitating student teachers from seven different teacher education institutions and believed the school could not refuse such requests as some student teachers were past pupils. Mr. Kelly (SP) appeared to feel frustrated at being in this position and wanted to stand up to the university. Mr. Clancy (SP) felt somewhat aggrieved, feeling that the

support of schools for PETE student learning *"was not to be assumed"* (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview, February 16th 2007). Mr. Noonan (SP) *asserted "the university needs to get real in terms of who is serving who"* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). Moreover, there was a feeling that the current situation was untenable; Mr. Cotter felt that the school was delivering the TP placement free of charge to the university and therefore it was not valued by the university (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007). Mr. Clancy (SP) advocated a different partnership between school and university on TP. He described a *"programme of support, mutual support up to and including financial support"* between school and university (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview, February 16th 2007). Similarly, Mr. Cotter (SP) advocated that universities should pay schools to coordinate and mentor PETE students instead of the current arrangement, about which he felt increasingly unhappy, and said that *"money was a way of indicating that you value something"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007). In essence, Mr. Cotter (SP) wanted an arrangement between the university and the school where there was acknowledgement of the *"huge amount of work [that] isn't acknowledged"* (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

University Ignoring the Role of SP in TP

Further to the above concerns there were also issues regarding the way in which the views of SPs were valued by universities. One UT, Noelle, acknowledged that the university was currently ignoring the SPs role in TP and that this was perhaps unwise, due to the power of the school principal as the *"gatekeeper"* (UT, Noelle, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007). Certainly, one SP, Mr. Noonan felt that school principals were largely ignored by the university. With regard to assessment of TP, he stated that there was no mechanism in place for school principal feedback. He advocated a robust system of assessment for student teacher learning that included SP feedback.

Conclusion

This chapter's findings addressed the following research questions:

Main Research Question 1: How are PETE students supported to learn effectively during TP within the existing partnership model?

And part of the following research question:

Main Research Question 2: How do teacher-mentors and university tutors view their roles and the nature of learning within the current model of TP supervision?

Findings from this research support those of other international studies that highlight the ways in which PETE student learning is fundamentally affected by the quality of the relationship between school and university during TP (Hardy, 1999; Kiely, 2005; McIntyre et al., 1996). Specifically, this study found, that PETE student learning was profoundly affected by the lack of parity within the School-University Relationship and that PETE students were not supported to learn by UTs or SPs during TP. The school was treated as *"peripheral"* in TP, by the university (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview, February 16th 2007). There was evidence in this research of schools being very hostile towards the university. There was also a feeling that schools felt exploited by the university and that during TP, schools were compelled to accept PETE students for TP with little prior notice, information or monetary recompense. In addition, the SP was rarely consulted by UTs on PETE student progress.

This chapter has charted how PETE student perception of UT expertise coupled with witnessing open hostility between CT and UT undermined their respect for the UT. In this situation, PETE students may have felt that they could not learn from the UT, and this closed down another avenue for learning for the PETE student. Thus, the PETE student was trapped in this "two-worlds pitfall" (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1985), which created a very unstable learning environment for them (McIntyre et al., 1996).

Two key sources of PETE student learning on TP, the CT (see Chapter Twelve) and UT, were now defunct and the PETE student was forced to become self-reliant in her quest for PCK, turning to books and the Internet to supplement her knowledge. In Chapter Fourteen, the third and final set of findings is reported as a key theme, exploring the nature of PETE student learning in this study.

Chapter Fourteen: Theme Three - The Overt and Hidden Curriculum of Teaching Practice

Introduction

This chapter collates data reported in the five case studies, in order to present findings comprising the third data theme: the overt and hidden curriculum of TP. This theme specifically addresses the following research questions:

> *Main Research Question 1*: How are PETE students supported to learn effectively during TP within the existing partnership model?
> *Main Research Question 3*: What is the nature of PETE student learning that takes place during TP?
> *Main Research Question 4:* How does school-based learning link to other strands of the teacher education programme in supporting student teacher competence?

Situated Learning: Community of Practice and Legitimate Peripheral Participation

Terroir is a term unique to the French language and French wine making. It refers to the sum of all the external influences on grape growing, often translated as a 'sense of place'. The interplay of soil, bedrock, sun and wind exposure, water table, climate, farming methods come together in a unique expression in the wine, which is specific to a particular region. The theory of *terroir* encompasses the almost metaphysical circle of soil, nature, appellation and human activity. Culture is etymologically related to *terroir*, as it has at its root the latin *colere,* meaning to till. Culture, therefore, is *terroir*.

Lave & Wenger's (1991) 'situated' perspective on learning seems to have strong parallels with the concept of *terroir*. Just as the characteristics of wine are influenced by the *terroir* which they, in turn, influence, so too is the person by the culture in which s/he is located. As outlined in the literature review on 'learning' (Chapter Two), the view of learning as 'situated', therefore, incorporates a number of linked theories that centre on the whole person and on the relationship between that person and the context and culture in which

they learn (Resnick, 1994, p.16). This study adopted a 'situated learning' perspective in order to investigate how culture and context comprising teaching practice (TP) influenced PETE student learning. From a situative perspective, learning occurs whenever individuals interact, which, in the case of this study, is characterised by interactions within each case study tetrad; i.e. between the PETE student, cooperating teacher (CT), university tutor (UT) and school principal (SP). Data illustrate the ways in which the cultural fabric within each of the tetrads influenced the pedagogical identity (Zukas, 2006) of the PETE student determining how, what, where, when and from whom the PETE student learned during TP.

Using an anthropological view of learning, Lave and Wenger (1991) describe learning as a process of participation in 'communities of practice'. As was noted in Chapter Two, within the framework of communities of practice, Lave and Wenger (1991) explored learning in both formal and informal contexts, thus developing their theory of Legitimate Peripheral Participation (LPP). In the context of this research, initially, participation by PETE students was legitimately 'peripheral'. Over time, however, data illustrate the ways in which the PETE student gradually increased engagement in the practices of the community, moving *"centripetally towards full participation"* (Maynard, 2001, p.41). In so doing, the PETE students both absorbed and were absorbed in the culture of practice. Learning within the community therefore involved the PETE student in becoming a different kind of person or in the construction of identity (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p.53) through engagement with CTs and UTs.

Often, the situated view of learning assumes that encouraging participation in the existing community of practice:

> *Is a good thing, it provides no tools for judging what is deemed 'good' in a particular situation* (Fenwick, 1999, p.1).

It is important to acknowledge that the mere existence of a community of practice does not mean that the community is a well-functioning social entity, or a positive catalyst for effective learning; it can also be dysfunctional in ways that subvert the quality of learning (McLaughlin & Talbert, 2001; Wenger,

1998). Wenger (1998) outlined how the core characteristics of a community of practice can be dysfunctional:

> *Most situations that involve sustained interpersonal engagement generate their fair share of tensions and conflicts. In some communities of practice, conflict and misery can even constitute the core characteristic of shared practice...A community of practice is neither a haven of togetherness nor an island of intimacy insulated from political and social relations. Disagreement, challenges and competition can all be forms of participation* (p.77).

As outlined in Chapter Two, the community is defined by its practice in which explicit and implicit knowledge or curriculum can be hidden or overt. In this study the hidden curriculum was very powerful. In fact, each of the five PETE students experienced the rhetoric of TP (overt curriculum) but learned the hidden curriculum as the CTs, SPs and UTs often did the opposite to what they said.

In some respects, the findings in this study support those reported in other international teacher learning studies. It was found, for example, that PETE student learning was situated, occurred through legitimate peripheral participation within a communities of practice framework, and was shaped by the culture of that community of practice. In particular, this study found that each PETE student learned the hidden curriculum of their community of practice. The official or overt curriculum centred around the development of the PETE student as a professional, however the hidden curriculum often conspired to undermine this by propagating the opposite message. In this chapter, such development involves five key premises which are captured in the following five PETE professional teaching standards identified in Chapter Six (see p.113). These five standards will be used to organise the discussion and reporting of the findings.

1. **PETE students are committed to pupils and pupil learning**

   This standard will be subdivided into two for ease of reporting i.e.

   a. PETE students are committed to pupils
   b. PETE students are committed to pupil learning

2. **PETE students have strong pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) in physical education**

3. **PETE students are responsible for management and assessment of pupil learning**
4. **PETE students are reflective practitioners**
5. **PETE students are members of learning communities**

Professional Standard 1(a): PETE students were committed to <u>pupils</u>

McCullick (2001) asserts that PETE students need to have *"a genuine concern for the welfare of their students [pupils]"* (p.41). In addition, the PETE student must enjoy being around people, especially children and exhibit a gregarious personality which should encourage pupil learning (ibid). Wubbels, Levy & Brekelmans (1997) suggested that effective teachers have strong student-teacher relationships and are empathic, but in control. The examples below support the finding that many of the study's participants recognised the importance of PETE students' commitment toward pupils.

<u>Example One: Case Studies – Barbara, Carol and Edel [Claire was UT to each of these PETE students]</u>

One UT, Claire wanted to see that PETE students exhibited a strong commitment to the pupils in their care, before during and after classes:

> *And then their...their commitment to kids. I mean, you know, are they interested in the kids? Do they enjoy the kids? I mean it's just...do they simply enjoy being around the kids? Can you see the way that they interact with the kids? And particularly in a gymnasium when class is over or before class starts* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

In this respect, Claire expected that PETE students would be inclusive of all pupils in their care:

> *I do have some...certain values that if they are not adhered to I don't tolerate. And that is inclusiveness. They can't be sexist. They can't be in any way sort of racist. They can't be ...for want of a better word, in terms of the...the more able kids than the less able in terms of motor ability. They should be there for all of their kids* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

<u>Example Two: Case Study - Carol</u>

Mr. O'Brien (SP) agreed with Claire (UT) and wanted PETE students to learn how to interact positively with pupils throughout the school day, not just in class time. In effect, he wanted to see whether the PETE student had *"a*

presence" in the school (DP, Mr. O'Brien, Interview Deputy Principal, February 12th 2007).

Example Three: Case Study - Dara

Mr. Clancy (SP) asserted that a teacher needed to learn to care about pupils, to have a pastoral role (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Example Four: Case Study - Barbara

John (CT) wanted PETE students to get to know his pupils as individuals (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007). John's School Principal, Mr. Cotter, agreed asserting that the PETE student must develop both as a person and as a teacher in order to understand and empathise with pupils (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

Example Five: Case Study - Edel

Mr. Noonan (SP) worried that PETE students did not seem to have a duty of care toward their pupils: for example if a schooltour bus returned ten minutes before the final school bell, PETE students would not supervise the pupils and would let pupils *"wander off home"* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007).

Data, in this study, also confirmed that PETE students valued the skill of caring for pupils but they also noted that this aspect of professionalism was not taught at university.

Example One: Case Study - Aoife

Aoife (PETE student) thought that learning to interact with pupils in a positive way was very important. However, she observed that this was not explicitly taught at the university:

> *You need more people...like they [Greendale University] don't really go on to people skills ...like do you know, I mean a lot of jobs focus on ...like even hairdressing when they are doing training on people skills, dealing with different people like...do you know* (PETE student, Aoife, Focus Group, March 29th 2007).

Example Two: Case Study - Dara

PETE student, Dara, also agreed that positive pupil interactions were crucial. Again, she asserted that, in reality, neither the school nor the university had provided formal opportunities for this skill to be learned; instead, it had been learned informally in the school setting:

> *I think that's a big part that I learned inside in the school. You were dealing with different...students. Not...but not just their behaviour...but just actually talking at their level of...you know, like they are much younger...like you know...knowing what they are into...not what they are into like...*(PETE student, Dara, Focus Group, March 29th 2007).

To summarise, overtly, it was deemed that pupil welfare should be a key concern for PETE students by members of each tetrad but it was not formally taught as part of the ITE curriculum. The curriculum encouraged the PETE students to self-direct their learning in this regard. This could be regarded as a risky strategy as such learning was largely left to chance. Freire (1998) contended:

> *No one can be in the world, with the world, and with others and maintain a posture of neutrality. I cannot be in the world decontextualised, simply observing life. Yes, I can take up my position and settle myself, but only so as to become aware of my insertion into a context of decision, choice, and intervention* (p.73).

Clearly, a PETE student's commitment to pupils may have a positive or negative impact on pupils. Therefore, the contention here is that, perhaps, the schools and university needed to both interrogate and hone PETE student commitment toward pupils, in order to ensure that PETE students develop a strong, positive relationship with pupils.

Professional Standard 1(b): PETE students were committed to pupil learning

O'Sullivan (2003) asserts that schools and universities involved in the preparation of PETE students need to connect teacher education with pupil learning. In this study, two UTs and two CTs commented on this issue:

Example One: Case Studies - Barbara, Carol and Edel [Claire was UT to each of these PETE students]

Claire, UT, described how she wanted PETE students to display a curiosity about their teaching and how it impacted on pupil learning:

> *I mean are they...are they curious and interested in...in what they are learning about their subject, you know, are they...you know, did I...did I teach that right, did I copy the right stuff? Did I use the right progressions? Did I ...you know, did I deliver that in a way that was you know aligned with...so...so a curiosity and a set of questions about...about that* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

Example Two: Case Study - Dara

Liz wanted the PETE student to constantly progress pupil learning, and not to become preoccupied with their own confidence issues (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006).

Example Three: Case study - Dara

Anita reported that effective PE teaching involved *"opportunities to learn and enjoy"* (CT, Anita, Questionnaire, September 2006).

Example Four: Case study - Edel

Joan (CT) suggested the PETE teacher needed to learn to be:

> *Motivated, competent and ensures that learning is taking place and a teacher whose students [pupils] enjoy learning* (CT, Joan Questionnaire, September 2006).

Interestingly, none of the SPs referred to any specific ways in which PETE students might progress pupil learning. In addition, PETE students were silent on this issue, which might be explained by Fuller's (1969) 'Concerns based model'. As was illustrated in Chapter Twelve, PETE students move through Fuller's (1969) Concerns-based model when learning to teach; thus, they move from (i) concerns about self to (ii) concerns about tasks to (iii) concerns about students [pupils] and the impact of teaching. It seemed that both UTs and CTs had an expectation that these PETE students would move through the three phases quickly to focus on pupil learning. Tellingly, they did not describe how they might help this to happen. So, overtly, the curriculum contended again that pupil learning was very important, yet the hidden curriculum did not actively educate the PETE student in how to progress pupil

learning. PETE students, therefore, learned that keeping pupils active and enjoying class was imperative and was more highly valued than progressing pupil learning. This finding supports that of Placek (1983, p.49) who demonstrated that PE teachers often regard their lessons to be successful when children are *"busy, happy, good"* and that pupil learning is often a relatively low priority.

Professional Standard 2: PETE students had strong pedagogical knowledge (PCK) in physical education

In the Irish PE programme there are seven content strands: Adventure Activities, Aquatics, Athletics, Dance, Games, Gymnastics and Health Related Fitness (Department of Education and Science, 2003). All five PETE students studied Health Related Fitness as part of their primary degree at Brightwater University and so could be regarded as semi-specialists in this area. Three PETE students also had a wide range of expertise in games coaching garnered from sporting hobbies before coming to Greendale University. In fact, John (CT) commented that Barbara (PETE student) would have a superior knowledge of games to him (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007). However, in areas such as Adventure Activities, Aquatics, Athletics, Dance and Gymnastics, all five PETE students had very limited PCK. To remedy this lack of PCK, prior to entering the graduate programme at Greendale, all PETE students attended short courses at Brightwater University (PETE Student, Carol, Focus Group, March 29th 2007). Dara described how Greendale University admitted the PETE students on to the Grad Dip in the belief that they had learned PCK in all seven strands during their undergraduate degree programme at Brightwater (Dara, PETE student, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). Therefore, the programme at Greendale University included very few practical courses (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). Four CTs in this study appeared to expect PETE students to have adequate PCK when starting TP, as, perhaps, they believed that TP was an opportunity for PETE students to practise PCK, not to learn it. As discussed in Chapter Twelve, this finding supports Kay's (2004) study, as CTs showed a lack of empathy for PETE students who did not have adequate PCK. It seemed that CTs believed it was the role of the university, not the school, to teach PCK to the PETE students. This may be because schools

see their role in teacher training as subsidiary to their responsibility to pupils (Williams & Soares, 2002, p.105). Therefore, PETE students struggled with their level of PCK on TP. The following examples illustrate this point:

Example One: Case study - Aoife

Aoife displayed crucial gaps in her basketball PCK and knowledge of safe learning environments. Therefore Louise did not want Aoife to teach gymnastics (CT, Louise, Interview 3, February 2007).

Example Two: Case study - Barbara

John (CT) described how Barbara (PETE student) couldn't plan for the optimum amount of content in her soccer class and was too "*ambitious*" (CT, John, Interview 3, February 12th 2007).

Example Three: Case study - Carol

Another CT, Michael was not confident in Carol's (PETE student) PCK as her undergraduate degree in Brightwater did not include intensive blocks of PE practicals. He believed that the four-year Greendale degree programme better prepared the students for teaching as it included intensive practical modules (CT, Michael, Interview 3, February 16th 2007).

Overall, in this study, four CTs were either unable or unwilling to support their PETE students in their PCK learning and so Carol, Edel, Aoife and Dara (PETE students) turned to reference books and the Internet for this knowledge:

Example One: Case study - Carol

In the absence of adequate support from her CT, Michael, Carol sought PCK in books. She contended that TP practice demanded that students were self-motivated and that learning PCK was "*more down to the individual*" (Carol, PETE student, Interview 2, December 4th 2006).

Example Two: Case study - Edel

Edel (PETE student) explained that her PCK came from a range of sources. She seemed to be very resourceful, taking PCK from her undergraduate

degree, UTs, books and the Internet (PETE student, Edel, Interview 2, December 11th 2006).

Example Three: Case study - Aoife

Aoife (PETE student) described her mechanisms of bolstering her PCK through books and the Internet. She seemed to spend hours preparing for classes and learning her PCK through books and the Internet. In order to learn PCK she used a technique of visualisation:

> *I do practice out the skills and I read the points and actually visualise myself doing it on a practical setting* (PETE student, Aoife, Interview 2, December 2007).

Louise, her CT noticed this but did not offer to help her learn PCK.

Example Four: Case study - Dara

To bridge the gaps in her PCK, Dara gathered relevant knowledge from a variety of sources. She learned PCK from Anita (CT). She spoke in effusive terms of how helpful Anita had been. Dara also admired how creative Anita was with her PCK: *"She just came up with a lot of stuff herself"* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). In addition, she sought help from relevant UTs, when necessary and believed that learning from an expert in an area was the best source of PCK: *"It was great in comparison to the books"* (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). However, Dara added that not all the PETE students were as resourceful as her in gathering PCK (PETE student, Dara, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). She contended that the university could only teach a portion of PCK and that the student teacher needed to actively supplement PCK.

In summary, all five PETE students were expected to have sufficient PCK in each of the seven strands of the PE programme on entering the Grad Dip programme at Greendale University. Therefore, PCK development in these areas was not included in the Greendale programme. UTs in this study did not accommodate PETE student levels of PCK. In addition, four of the CTs, all graduates of Greendale University, seemed to think that educating PETE students in PCK was not their job. One CT, Louise did try to express concern about her PETE student's level of PCK to Noelle (UT) and was promptly dismissed (CT, Louise, Interview 3, February 13th 2007). In effect, both CTs

and UTs abdicated responsibility for teaching PETE students PCK. So, while the overt curriculum asserted the importance of high quality PCK, the hidden curriculum encouraged PETE students to learn PCK through Internet and books.

Professional Standard 3: PETE students are responsible for management and assessment of pupil learning

Van Der Mars (2006) posits that teachers create opportunities for pupil learning in the classroom through both classroom management and instructional planning. During ITE the PETE student learns this skill. In addition, PETE students learn to assess pupil learning which is defined as:

> *A variety of tasks and settings where students [pupils] are given opportunities to demonstrate their knowledge, skill, understanding and application of content in a context that allows continued learning and growth* (Siedentop & Tannehill, 2000, p.179).

Example One: Case study – Barbara, Carol and Edel [Claire was UT to each of these PETE students]

Claire (UT) asserted that the PETE student must learn a variety of skills including the planning and executing of classroom management, instruction and assessment. More than this, Claire wanted PETE students to learn to justify their planning in relation to their pupils and overall school policy:

> *And, I suppose, genuinely, I have very little tolerance for students who are not prepared to plan. Now they...I don't need pages. That's not what I am interested in. But have they thought about what they are trying to do and why? not just the what? but the why? And have they thought about why they are going to deliver in a particular way and why that would facilitate what they are about? So, it's not just the content. And a lot of times we get ...we get caught up in the management issues and that's fine, it's their survival. But have they given some thought and are they willing to give some thought to both the instructional aspects of it, and the why?...what am I doing and why is this school offering what it's offering in the first place?* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

Example Two: Case study - Edel

However, Mr. Noonan (SP) identified that, in reality, classroom management was an area where PETE students were lacking in expertise. In particular, he cited that PETE students had a difficulty with coping with timetables. Mr.

Noonan added that, as a PE teacher *"management of time is the most critical thing they have to do"* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview, February 16th 2007). It is interesting to note here, that Mr. Noonan sees classroom management or more specifically, time management, as the most important aspect of PE teachers or, in this case, PETE students' work.

Example Three: Case study - Barbara

In relation to classroom management, Mr. Cotter, a second SP, remarked that PETE students in class did not seem to grasp that the pupils had to learn a syllabus of material in a given amount of time and tended to spend too much time on particular areas (SP, Mr. Cotter, Interview, February 12th 2007).

It is interesting to note that while one UT, Claire, focused on classroom management, instruction and assessment of pupil learning, the two schools in this study tended to be more concerned with time management and the smooth running of the timetable. Therefore, overtly, there are conflicting messages. The university asserted the importance of planning, instruction and assessment of pupil learning. However, the school contended that time management is the most important PETE student skill to ensure that school timetables are not disrupted. This was confusing for the PETE students, as it seemed they had one skill set to learn for the university and another for the school. This finding links to a study by McCullick (2001) which found that divergent expectations of university and school of PETE students' abilities can lead to tensions. These conflicts have an adverse effect on PETE student learning (Kahan, 1999).

Professional Standard 4: PETE students are reflective practitioners

Tsangaridou & Siedentop (1995) contend that reflective practice during TP is a core element which prepares PETE students for the unexpected in the classroom. According to Behets and Vergauwen (2006), the critical role of reflection for teachers is shaped by the emphasis on reflection within the ITE programme. Effectively, the programme's view of reflection determines what PETE students learn about teaching (Sebren, 1994). In this study, three UTs, one SP and one PETE student identified the importance of reflection:

Example One: Case study – Barbara, Carol and Edel [Claire was UT to each of these PETE students]

Claire (UT) described reflection in terms of PETE student learning to be about curiosity and interest in their own learning:

> *I mean are they...are they curious and interested in...in what they are learning about their subject, you know, are they...you know, did I...did I teach that right, did I copy the right stuff? Did I use the right progressions? Did I ...you know, did I deliver that in a way that was you know aligned with learning outcomes...so...so a curiosity and a set of questions about...about that* (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

Example Two: Case study - Aoife

Sinead (UT) describes how she is also *"interested in the reflection afterwards"* (UT, Sinead, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2008) when assessing a PETE student's TP portfolio.

Example Three: Case study - Aoife

Through such reflective practice, Noelle (UT) described how the PETE student would develop their own teaching style and become an autonomous teacher:

> *Actually making their own identity or remit as a teacher and not following particular rules or routes that we think they want you to go. And I like...I think the most rewarding is, that people [PETE students] can actually make a case for the way that they actually are teaching* (Noelle, UT, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

Example Four: Case study - Barbara

Mr. Cotter (SP) described how feedback and reflective practice encouraged PETE students to become more self-aware of their impact on pupils but in his opinion, this was not happening in teacher training (SP, Mr. Cotter Interview Principal, February 12th 2007).

Example Five: Case study - Edel

Edel, a PETE student, knew that not all PETE students found the reflective process helpful as they said *"it was a drudge"*. However, Edel was of the view that reflection helped her to *"grow as a teacher"* (PETE student, Edel, Interview 2, December 11th 2006).

Example Six: Case Study - Dara

Liz (UT) contended that Dara would only learn if she used *"genuine reflection"* (UT, Liz, Interview Tutor, December 4th 2006).

Even though the UTs realised the importance of reflective practice, and it is something emphasised at the university in teacher training, just one SP also acknowledged its value but said that he could not see evidence of it in teacher education. None of the CTs in this study referred to reflective practice. The overt curriculum of the community of practice values reflective practice in learning to teach. However, the fact that just one PETE student valued the importance of reflective practice in her teaching may indicate that the hidden message is that it is the PETE student's responsibility to learn this skill. This finding links with Byra's (1996) assertion that the supervisory process on TP is crucial in promoting PETE students' reflective skills.

Professional Standard 5: PETE students were members of learning communities

The concept of teacher learning communities is informed by Wenger and Lave & Wenger's work on communities of practice where their interest resided with existing professional communities and how membership, participation, and meaning are negotiated and reflected in action (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). A learning community or community of practice allows learners to develop skills and knowledge, which they can share with other members of those communities (Jonassen, 1995). Further, when PETE students are:

> *Confronted with meaningful, real world problems, learning communities apply sophisticated repertoires of knowledge* (ibid, p. 60).

Claire (UT) asserted the importance of PETE students becoming members of a community of practice:

Example One: Case study - Barbara, Carol and Edel [Claire was UT to each of these PETE students]

Claire (UT) described how PETE students needed to commit to the teaching profession by being active members of the school community:

> *Their ability to see themselves as part of a school, as part of a commitment to a profession. Do they ask questions about that? Are they interested in that? And do*

they see their connection beyond the four walls of the gymnasium as in this particular case? Are they curious? Do they look...so where...where am I going to go next? (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

In addition, Claire (UT) remarked that PETE students must exhibit professionalism by being respectful of other colleagues:

I also won't tolerate their disrespect of other teachers, in terms of fundamental sort of professionalism (UT, Claire, Tutor Focus Group, January 17th 2007).

In this study, all five PETE students were legitimately peripheral to their respective community of practice. There were two mechanisms by which old-timers (CTs, SPs) brought newcomers (PETE students) centripetally to the core (Maynard, 2001) of their community of practice:

(a) School Induction programmes.

(b) UT and CT supervision of PETE students.

(a) School Induction Programmes.

Schools sometimes have an Induction programme to help orient student teachers and new teachers in the new school setting. Often a member of the teaching staff is assigned to manage the induction programme. In this study, three of the five schools had an Induction policy.

Example One: Case study - Barbara

Barbara, PETE student, was very impressed that Byron's Way school had an Induction Programme for new teachers. The School Induction Coordinator was very supportive and available:

And she came up and sat down with us and said, if you ever...if you have any problems or you need to talk or anything like that, just come look for me (PETE student, Barbara, Focus Group, March 29th 2007).

Example Two: Case study - Edel

Bayview School also had an active Induction Programme for student teachers and beginning teachers (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). The coordinator of this programme was chosen because she "*was a very personable, nice girl...It was good to have some kind of nice friendly face*" (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview, February 16th 2007).

Example Three: Case study - Dara

Mountview school had an Induction programme for PETE students, but it was inactive as the School Induction Coordinator was ill (SP, Mr. Clancy, Interview, February 16th 2007).

Two schools did not have a formal Induction programme in place for novice teachers.

Example One: Case study - Aoife

Mr. Kelly (SP) in TowerHill School described how they did not have an Induction Policy formulated. Mr. Kelly asserted that student teachers were inducted to his school simply by not being segregated and being allowed into the staffroom: "*There is no separate room or anything like that for them. They are up in the staff room where they are with everybody*" (SP, Mr. Kelly, Interview, 13th February 2007).

Example Two: Case study - Carol

Carol, PETE student, felt very isolated in the school, and said that there was "*no induction programme for student teachers*" (PETE student, Carol, Interview 3, February 16th 2007). She had not been invited to the Staff Christmas Party "*I wasn't invited, but I wouldn't go*" (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2006). Carol described how no-one in the school, had time to talk to her "*I kind of sneak off. Nobody even knows I exist...they don't even know my name*" (PETE student, Carol, Interview 2, December 4th 2007).

Clearly, findings indicate that three UTs and three SPs overtly advocated the importance of community of practice membership for PETE students. For these PETE students, being positioned at the border or on the periphery of the community of practice seemed to be fraught with an energy which was both constructive and destructive. For one PETE student, Carol, the energy was so destructive that she remained on the periphery. The remaining four PETE students all learned the hidden curriculum, which advocated resilience, resourcefulness and autonomy to survive unsupported learning on TP. They harnessed this 'constructive' energy and moved centripetally toward the core

of the dysfunctional community of practice. Untrained mentors and untrained UTs represented the oldtimers who guided their course. PETE students had learned how lack of supervision and help was part of the curriculum of this community of practice.

Conclusion

This chapter analysed and discussed the findings of this study in relation to three key research questions:

Main Research Question 1: How are PETE students supported to learn effectively during TP, within the existing partnership model?
Main Research Question 3: What is the nature of the PETE student learning that takes place on teaching practice?
Main Research Question 4: How does school based learning link to other strands of the teacher education programme in supporting student teacher competence?

In summary, effective ITE programmes possess a range of key characteristics, one of which is placing value on the strength of the school-university relationship in supporting PETE student learning (Darling-Hammond, 2006b). McCullick (2001) discovered that conflicts between school and university personnel are related to the curriculum of the school and university which are often developed through misunderstandings about learning to teach. Findings in this study supported this.

Each PETE student, in this study, was a member of a community of practice which comprised a unique set of circumstances and people intertwined in a tetrad: PETE student, SP, CT and UT. Findings indicate that each community of practice was fundamentally dysfunctional, as it was evident that there were two conflicting types of curriculum exhibited by the community of practice. The overt curriculum expressed by SPs, UTs and CTs valued a PETE student who cared for pupils, had a rich PCK, knew how to plan and assess pupils, valued reflection, and was an active member of a community of practice, the hidden curriculum propagated a very different message. Therefore, PETE students were guided to the core of the dysfunctional community of practice by untrained mentors and untrained UTs. PETE students learned a

curriculum which advocated an unsupported learning environment and just as the reproduction cycles intimate, were ready to perpetuate the same 'guidance' with other PETE students in the future.

Clearly, UTs and SPs, universities and schools must work together to:

> *Unconceal what is hidden, to contextualise what happens to us, to mediate the dialectic which keeps us on the edge, that may be keeping us alive (Greene, 1967pp. 5-6)*

In this respect, Clark (1988) advocated that teacher educators take the "risky and exciting step" of systematically studying their own practice in relation to their own beliefs and implicit theories regarding teacher education. Only through this interrogation can teacher education be improved as a mechanism for producing high quality professional teachers.

Chapter Fifteen: Conclusion, Thesis Contribution and Future Research

Introduction

This study is the first qualitative review of PETE student professional learning on TP undertaken in Ireland. The research adopted a case study approach because the phenomenon being studied; i.e. PETE student professional learning, could not be separated from its context (Yin, 1994). The research hinged around one umbrella case study (university, PETE students and the schools) which comprised of five individual cases: tetrads of PETE student, CT, UT and SP. The empirical data were collected over a seven month period and qualitative data collection methods were used to gather data; specifically, open profile questionnaires, recording of key events, in-depth interviews, focus group interviews, collection of artefacts and the researcher's reflective journal. The data were analysed using a systematic six-level grounded theory method (Harry et al., 2005). Issues of reliability have been addressed by ensuring that the methods and findings are reported in a detailed and accessible manner. Although precise replication of the study in the traditional sense would be difficult, sufficient methodological information is provided to ensure that a similar study could be undertaken in the future (Kirk & Miller, 1986). With respect to issues of validity, the concept of crystallisation (Richardson, 2000) was adopted; the researcher viewed the issue under investigation from the viewpoints of all participants in this study: PETE students, CTs, UTs and SPs.

Working within a qualitative research paradigm, this study addressed four main research questions and five sub-questions:

Main Research Questions

1. How are PETE students supported to learn effectively during TP within the existing partnership model?
2. How do teacher-mentors and university tutors view their roles and the nature of learning within the current model of TP supervision?

3. What is the nature of the PETE student learning that takes place during TP?
4. How does school-based learning link to other strands of the teacher education programme in supporting student teacher competence?

Sub-questions

1. What does international research literature say about teacher learning and student teacher learning?
2. From international research literature, what is known about different models of teacher learning and on what theories of learning are they based?
3. How is mentoring framed within these theories of learning?
4. Which learning theories underpin ITE supervision models?
5. What are the theoretical underpinnings of the current model of TP supervision within the Grad Dip at Greendale University?

This concluding chapter comprises four sections:

1. Thesis conclusions
2. Contribution of the research to existing knowledge.
3. Limitations of the research.
4. Recommendations for future research

Thesis Conclusions

The conclusions are reported as follows:

(a) A summary of each of the literature review chapters.

(b) An assimilation of the research findings.

In each case the research questions will be used to anchor the discussion.

(a) A summary of the findings from each of the literature review chapters.

Each of the literature review chapters answered specific sub-questions posed in this study.

Chapter Two investigated teacher learning and student learning in order to address the following two research questions:

Sub-question 1: What does international research literature say about teacher learning and student teacher learning?
Sub-question 2: From international research literature, what is known about different models of teacher learning and on what theories of learning are they based?

International literature on learning demonstrated that, currently, learning is widely viewed as situated and as a form of social practice. This means that both environment/context and social interactions have a role in fostering learning and this is captured in the notion of a community of practice (Wenger, 1998). Applying this concept of learning to the TP context in this research, it can be argued that student teachers are perceived to be members of a community of practice that comprises peers, CTs, UTs and SPs and that facilitates ongoing discussion, sharing, and collaboration on commonly valued issues and concerns (Mawer, 1996). It can also be argued that student teachers, as newcomers, are legitimately located on the energy-laden periphery of their community of practice (Heaney, 1995, p.3). The oldtimers, or CTs in this research, should move the student teachers (newcomers) to the core and to full participation in the community of practice as the newcomers engaged in a process of meaning-making to form both their personal and pedagogic identity (Zukas, 2006).

Chapter Three investigated international literature on mentoring with a view to answering this research question:

Sub-question 3: How is mentoring framed within these theories of learning?

Staying with the notion of learning, Chapter Three investigated the concept of mentoring and its links with situated learning theories within communities of practice (Wenger, 1998) and legitimate peripheral participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991). This chapter concluded that mentoring remains an elusive term for which there is no commonly accepted definition. In the literature on

this area, mentoring was often defined in terms of mentor tasks. This became clear in the analysis of mentor-mentee relationships, the range of types, models, and styles of mentoring, and characteristics of ideal mentors. Existing literature contends that mentors must have excellent interpersonal skills and emotional intelligence (Cothran et al., 2008), be well known as scholars and professionals (Manathunga, 2007) and have secure PCK expertise (Cothran et al., 2008). Therefore, it can be argued that mentors should be selected on the basis of suitability for the role, in respect of both disposition and expertise; a concept which is captured in Huberman's (1989) professional career cycle model. Looking specifically at ITE, the chapter outlined the ways in which the mentor-mentee relationship in ITE is often hierarchical, with the mentee (PETE student) being viewed as subordinate to the mentor (CT). It would appear that this view is grounded in the notion that the mentor is deemed the expert, while the PETE student is defined as a novice in the relationship. Following on from this, it was also noted that mentoring can be construed as an inherently political act within ITE, particularly where mentors are cast as assessors of the mentee (PETE student) performance during TP.

Chapter Four explored the policies and practices inherent in ITE models worldwide and linked them to concepts of learning and mentoring already visited in the previous two chapters. This information was used to answer these two research questions:

Sub-question 4: Which learning theories underpin ITE supervision models?
Sub-question 5: What are the theoretical underpinnings of the current model of TP supervision at Greendale University?

This chapter explored the pivotal role of the teacher within a global 'knowledge-based economy' (Drucker, 1992) and how this impacts on ITE in Europe, Ireland, the UK, the US, Japan and Australia. It would appear that across the world, governments are placing the onus firmly on the teacher to educate 'human resources' who can contribute to their economies. In addition, governments expect that teachers will address the societal fallout from the 'knowledge-based economy' (Drucker, 1992) i.e. changes in the family unit and demographics. There is, therefore, an imperative in ITE

programmes to produce teachers who are skilled for this challenge. Perhaps in response to these demands, many ITE programmes have embraced situated learning, with mentoring as a core initiative, and strong school-university partnerships supporting the TP function. However, some countries i.e. Ireland, Africa, West Indies and South Africa, have not fully embraced this practice. The Irish Government, while supporting two key mentoring initiatives (see p.2), has not implemented a national policy on mentoring in Teacher Education which forges strong school-university partnerships. This has led to student teachers experiencing a variety of levels of learning support from CTs during TP. This might explain why the ITE programme at Greendale University, located in Ireland, appeared to foster a largely cognitive approach to learning during TP, with informal school-university partnerships and untrained mentors supporting PETE student learning.

Chapter Five examined the focal literature in the area of teacher learning in physical education and highlighted the fact that mentoring is currently viewed as a key reform tool for both upskilling teachers and educating PETE students. This chapter showed how the literature review in Chapters Two, Three and Four informed the derivation of the four main research questions in this study.

The literature review chapters informed the assimilation of the research findings of this study.

(b) An assimilation of the research findings

The key research findings are synthesised using the research questions to anchor the discussion.

Main Research Question 1: How are PETE students supported to learn effectively during TP within the existing partnership model?

Main Research Question 2:

How do teacher-mentors and university tutors view their roles and the nature of learning within current model of TP supervision?

The study concluded that PETE students were not supported to learn effectively by CTs, UTs or SPs during TP. This was due to the following:

(a) CTs were selected on the basis of availability rather than suitability (Fenwick, 1999) for TP and this caused problems for these PETE students and their professional learning. The suitability of the mentor was not determined by teacher expertise and disposition, as identified in Huberman's (1989) professional career cycle. A central TP office, remote from the PESS and EPS departments at Greendale University selected the TP school on the basis of geographical location and the PETE student was assigned to the CT therein, by default.

(b) CTs in this study were untrained as mentors and, because of this, tended to revert to the mentoring they themselves received as student teachers. In terms of PETE student learning, this resulted in something similar to the 'washout effect' as defined in the research (Stroot et al., 1993).

(c) Supporting Kay's (2004) study, CTs showed a lack of empathy towards PETE students who were perceived as not having adequate PCK; CTs believed that it was the university's duty to upskill them in PCK *not* the school.

(d) University tutors (UTs) were largely untrained for their role as TP supervisors and often had neither the expertise nor the disposition required for effective practice in the supervision role.

(e) There was a lack of shared purpose and disposition between CTs and UTs, who seemed to have differing views of their roles in preparing effective teachers. For example, CTs defended PETE student performance in post lesson conferences with UTs, regardless of lesson quality. There was a feeling that UTs were, in some way, to be thwarted as they were seen as 'the enemy' from which the PETE student must be protected.

(f) The findings from this research support those of other international studies that highlighted the ways in which PETE student learning was fundamentally affected by the quality of the relationship between school and university during TP (Hardy, 1999; McIntyre et al., 1996). Specifically, this study found that PETE student learning was profoundly affected by the lack of shared vision and understanding and

perceptions of a lack of parity within the School-University Relationship. Schools felt *"peripheral to the whole affair [teaching practice]"* (SP, Mr. Noonan, Interview Principal, February 16th 2007). School principals (SPs) in this study did not see the work of teacher preparation as a focal part of their work, viewing pupil learning as the school's central function. Nonetheless, SPs were incensed that they were not valued in the TP process. There was a feeling that UTs saw the university as omnipotent in TP matters making, for example, unilateral decisions when assessing PETE student performance.

As a result of the difficulties in providing effective support for PETE student learning on TP, there was evidence that PETE students became 'à la carte mentees', often taking charge of the mentor-mentee relationship and directing their own learning by deciding how, when and by whom to be mentored. In addition PETE students learned PCK from a range of sources. They tended to direct their learning in this respect, actively seeking PCK from CTs, UTs, books, Internet or self-selected mentors.

As was noted earlier in this thesis, in Chapter Four and Thirteen, international research advocates that school and university personnel must have a shared view of their roles so that ITE delivery becomes a rational joint enterprise (Hardy, 1999; McIntyre et al., 1996) designed to produce effective teachers. Therefore, based on the findings of this study, it can be argued that within ITE in Ireland, it would be helpful if UTs and CTs were trained specifically to provide high quality learning support for PETE students during TP. Such training could pave the way for the development of genuine partnerships between CTs and UTs, and between schools and universities, with both parties actively supporting PETE student learning on TP.

The nature of PETE student professional learning on TP was clearly affected negatively by the lack of effective support from CTs UTs and SPs.

Main Research Question 3: What is the nature of the PETE student learning that takes place during TP?

Main Research Question 4: How does school-based learning link to other strands of the teacher education programme in supporting student teacher competence?

In answer to the above two questions, this study concluded that the nature of each PETE student's learning was linked to the shared curriculum of school and university personnel within each PETE student's community of practice.

As has been noted in this thesis, each PETE student in this study was a member of a community of practice which shared practice to a certain extent through a unique set of circumstances and people intertwined in a tetrad: PETE student, SP, CT and UT. PETE student learning was situated, and PETE students learned from each of the other members of the tetrad. In Chapter Two, it was suggested that a community of practice is defined by its negotiated curriculum (Wenger, 1998) which in this study was found to be both overt and hidden. Findings indicate that the shared practice of each of the five communities of practice in this study was fundamentally dysfunctional. This is because there was clear evidence of two conflicting types of curriculum within each community of practice. There is evidence in this study that the hidden TP curriculum was very powerful indeed. For example, the overt TP curriculum expressed by SPs, UTs and CTs valued a PETE student who:

- Cared for pupils,
- Had a rich PCK,
- Knew how to plan and assess pupils,
- Valued reflection,
- Was an active member of a learning community.

On the other hand, the hidden TP curriculum of each community of practice propagated the opposite message. In other words, the PETE students recognised that the five characteristics of the overt curriculum were not valued in reality, because they were not supported to learn them by CTs or UTs (oldtimers) in their respective communities of practice.

Focusing particularly on the role of old-timers in the community of practice, the literature on mentoring in education suggests that mentors (oldtimers) must have excellent interpersonal skills and emotional intelligence (Cothran et al., 2008), be well known as scholars and professionals (Manathunga, 2007), have secure PCK expertise (Cothran et al., 2008) and should be selected on the basis of suitability for the role, in respect of both disposition and expertise; a concept which is captured in Huberman's (1989) professional career cycle model (Zukas, 2006). However, findings in this study show that oldtimers (CTs and UTs) were not trained as mentors and often were lacking *both* the expertise and disposition to support learning. As a result of this, all five PETE students moved toward the centre of their respective dysfunctional communities of practice, 'guided' by mentors and UTs who had limited training for a TP supervision role. If the fundamental unit of Irish PETE is a dysfunctional community of practice which does not support PETE student professional learning during formation of their pedagogic identity (Zukas, 2006), this has grave implications for the quality of PE teacher being educated for Irish classrooms and ultimately for pupil learning.

Contribution of this Study to Existing Knowledge

This thesis scrutinised the nature and quality of PETE student professional learning during TP. The focal conclusions have been addressed, in light of the study's aims and the research questions posed. As has been noted, this study is the first qualitative review of PETE student professional learning undertaken during TP in Ireland. The conclusions in this study have the potential to contribute to the body of knowledge on:

(a) Professional learning.

(b) Mentoring in teacher education.

(c) Overt and Hidden TP curriculum.

(d) School-University Partnerships on TP.

In this section, the potential contributions of this research study are outlined:

(a) Professional Learning: The first contribution is to the field of research in learning and more specifically professional learning during TP. This

study provides a vivid account of PETE student learning during TP from the perspective of each of the case study participants.

(b) Mentoring in Teacher Education: The second contribution is to the research domain on mentoring in ITE. This study's findings have illustrated the importance of:

a. Selecting mentors on the basis of both expertise and disposition (Cothran et al., 2008) which is linked to their professional career lifecycle (Huberman, 1989).

b. Training of mentors in teacher education: mentors should work as partners with UTs in educating PETE students in Ireland. This builds on the work of Kiely (2005), McCaughtry et al (2005), McCullick (2001), Hardy (1999) and McIntyre (1996) in this area.

c. Understanding the shifting power relationships between mentor and mentee. In much of the literature on mentoring, typically, the mentoring relationship is viewed as hierarchical, where the mentee is subordinate (Danielson, 2002). In the cases in this study, however, there were examples of the mentors taking subordinate – or at least passive - roles. PETE students seemed to feel that CTs were not sufficiently available or equipped to guide their learning and that, at times, the CT's feedback was superficial, repetitive or irrelevant; i.e. focusing solely on classroom management issues rather than on pupil learning progression. Ayers and Griffin (2005) expressed concern that explicit mention of power relationships in PETE mentoring has been *"remarkably absent"* from recent studies on PETE student mentoring (p.373). The findings from this research can add to the literature in this area.

(c) Overt and Hidden TP Curriculum: This study's findings highlight the importance of recognizing the potency of the hidden curriculum of teaching practice. It was clear in this study that the hidden TP curriculum was more powerful than the overt TP curriculum. In addition, the hidden TP curriculum was fully embraced by the PETE students, teaching some of them that that CTs and UTs were unlikely to support their learning effectively. Instead, in order to 'survive' TP,

they needed to become 'à la carte mentees' foraging for PCK in books and from the Internet.

(d) School-University Partnership in Teacher Education: the findings of this study illustrate clearly the complexity of school-university partnerships in ITE and suggest that parity of esteem and purpose in the partnership is crucial to the success of the TP programme. It was evident from this study's findings that there was lack of trust and respect between the five schools in this study and Greendale University, and this had detrimental effects on PETE student professional learning. This work extends the research of McCullick (2001), Hardy (1999) and McIntyre (1996) in this area.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations in this study fall under three key headings:

1. Generalisability
2. Reliability and validity
3. Researcher objectivity

Generalisability

In the Grad Dip Programme there were seventeen PETE students: fifteen females and two males. When the researcher made a presentation to students about the proposed research in August 2006, five female PETE students volunteered to take part in this study. Given the ratio of females to males, and the fact that a representative sample (in a qualitative sense) was not being sought, this sample of five female PETE students was deemed to be acceptable. It might have enhanced this study, however, to include the views of at least one male PETE student.

Merriam (1998) questioned the generalisability of outcomes from a single case to a larger population. It is acknowledged in this study that small qualitative studies are not generalisable in the more accepted sense, however, it is also argued that studies such as this have laudable qualities (Myers, 2000). In this study of Irish PETE students, the generalisability of the research does not emanate from how representative the sample might be, but

from the way in which the experiences are likely to be appropriate to other groups in related contexts. It can be argued that the strength of the qualitative approach employed in this study is the depth of exploration and description which produces a vivid and detailed understanding of the idiosyncrasies of the situation under investigation.

Reliability and Validity

It has been argued by Kirk & Miller (1986) that reliability in research is attained in two ways;

(a) The study is reported in a detailed and accessible manner so that it may be replicated.

(b) The results of the study are reported in a transparent way in terms of theoretically meaningful variables.

The researcher has addressed each of these demands in reporting this study.

In order to ensure reliability, the research procedure for this study has been documented in a detailed and clear manner (Minichiello et al., 1995) in Chapter Six. In theory, the research could be replicated, although there are clear challenges in seeking precise replication in studies of this nature. In addition, in order to ensure rigour in this research, there was an imperative to work with the reality of each case as it presented itself and thus to use data collection methods that suited the situation (Yin, 1994).

Researcher Positioning

It has been acknowledged in this study that the researcher had the status of both insider and outsider (Minichiello et al., 1995, p.182). The researcher had:

(a) Studied in the university at the centre of the study, as a PETE student herself;

(b) Was supervised by untrained mentors/cooperating teachers during TP;

(c) Had acted as an untrained mentor/cooperating teacher to PETE students from this university for eleven years;

(d) Had acted as an untrained UT representing this university and assessing PETE students on TP (although not for these students).

In all of these roles, the impact of lack of training of key personnel to support PETE student learning on TP concerned the researcher who decided to investigate this issue. Taking account of the researcher's knowledge of the context and her familiarity with the language of TP, it was difficult for the researcher to remain 'objective' in a traditional sense during the study. Therefore, in order to mediate for bias in the study, the researcher engaged in reflexivity *or "explicit, self-aware analysis of their own [researcher] role* (Finlay, 2002, p.531).

Impact of this research to date

As a result of this study the following developments have occurred:

- The PESS and EPS departments at Greendale University:
  - Initiated a mentor training programme for CTs.
  - Have had meetings with school principals with a view to improving school-university relationships.
- Saliford and Tersley Universities in the Republic of Ireland have commenced mentor training of CTs.
- Saliford University has developed a mechanism for harnessing mentor feedback on PETE student learning on TP.
- Saliford University works closely with the school principals and deputy principals to design a model of TP which supports effective PETE student learning through strong school-university partnerships.
- PETE educators from Greendale University, Saliford University and Tersley University have formed 'PETE Ireland' a body which shares and formulates best practice for PETE in the Republic of Ireland.

Recommendations for Future Research

- Evaluating the impact of training CTs as TP mentors on the quality of PETE student professional learning.

- Comparing the nature of male and female PETE student professional learning on TP.

- Examining the impact of gender on mentor-mentee relationships on TP and ultimately on PETE student professional learning.

- Evaluating the impact of training UTs as TP supervisors on the nature and quality of PETE student professional learning.

- Assessing the operation and impact of the hidden curriculum in teacher education programmes.

- Scrutinising the power relationships between mentor and mentee on TP and how this affects the quality of PETE student professional learning.

- Assessing the effects of school-university partnerships during TP on quality of PETE student professional learning.

Bibliography

Ahern, B., Sargent, T., & Harney, M. (2007). *Programme for Government.* Dublin: Department of the Taoiseach.

Allen, D., Benner, P., & Diekelmann, N. L. (1986). Three Paradigms for Nursing Research: Methodological Implications. In C. P. (Ed.), *Nursing Research Methodology* Rockville, MD: Aspen.

Amade-Escot, C. (2000). The Contribution of Two Research Programmes on Teaching Content: Pedagogical Content Knowledge" And The "Didactics of Physical Education". *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 20*, 78-101.

Anderson, D. S. (1987). The Professional Socialisation of School Teachers. In P. Hughes (Ed.), *Better Teachers for Better Schools* (pp. 46-65). Carlton, Victoria: Australian College of Education.

Anderson, G., & Arsenault, N. (2000). *Fundamentals of Educational Research* (2nd ed.). Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Answers.com. (2008). *Parity*. Retrieved 19th May 2008, from http://www.answers.com/topic/parity?cat=biz-fin

Armour, K. M., & Fernandez-Balboa, J. M. (2001). Connections, Pedagogy and Professional Learning. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 12*(1).

Armour, K. M., Makopoulou, K., & Chambers, F. (2007). The Learning Teacher in Physical Education, *Historical Traditions and Future Directions.* Pittsburgh, PA.

Armour, K. M., & Yelling, M. (2004). Professional 'Development' and Professional 'Learning': Bridging the Gap for Experienced Physical Education Teachers *European Physical Education Review, 10*(1), 71-93.

Armour, K. M., & Yelling, M. (2007). Effective Professional Development for Physical Education Teachers: The Role of Informal Collaborative Learning. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 26*, 177-200.

Armour, K. M., Yelling, M., & Duncombe, R. (2002). Warranted Research Findings and Changing Teachers' Practice: The Case of the Case Study, *BERA Conference*. Exeter.

Atherton, J. S. (2003a). *Learning and Teaching: Behaviourism* from http://www.dmu.ac.uk/~jamesa/learning/behaviour.htm

Atherton, J. S. (2003b, 21st September 2004). *Learning and Teaching: Constructivism*, from http://www.dmu.ac.uk/~jamesa/learning/constructivism.htm.

Atkins, M. (1993). Rejoinder: Theories of Learning and Multimedia Applications: An Overview',. *Research Paper in Education: Policy and Practice, 8*(2), 251-271.

Ayers, S., & Griffin, L. L. (2005). Pete Mentoring as a Mosaic. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 24*, 368-378.

Bailey, R. (2005). Evaluating the Relationship between Physical Education, Sport and Social Inclusion. *Educational Review, 57*(1), 71-90.

Barab, S. A., Barnett, M., & Squire, K. (2002). Developing an Empirical Account of a Community of Practice: Characterizing the Essential Tensions. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 11*(4), 489-542.

Barab, S. A., & Duffy, T. M. (2000). From Practice Fields to Communities of Practice. In D. H. Jonassen & S. M. Land (Eds.), *Theoretical Foundations of Learning Environments*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bartholomew, J. I. (1976). Schooling Teachers: The Myth of the Liberal College. In G. Whitty & M. Young (Eds.), *Explorations in the Politics of School Knowledge* (pp. 114-124). Driffield, England: Nafferton.

Becker, H. (1972). A School Is a Lousy Place to Learn Anything In. *American Behavioral Scientist, 16*, 85-105.

Begley, C. M. (1996). Triangulation of Commiunication Skills in Qualitative Research Instruments. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 24*, 688-693.

Behets, D., & Vergauwen, L. (2006). Learning to Teach in the Field. In D. Kirk, D. Macdonald & M. O'Sullivan (Eds.), *The Handbook of Physical Education*. London: Sage.

Berg, B. L. (1989). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences* Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Billett, S. (1998). Appropriation and Ontogeny: Identifying Compatibility between Cognitive and Sociocultural Contributions to Adult Learning and Development. *International Journal of Lifelong Education, 17*(1), 21-34.

Bishop, R. (2005). Freeing Ourselves from Neocolonial Domination in Research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.

Black, T. (1993). *Evaluating Social Science Research*. London: Sage.

Blackburn, R. T., Cameron, S. M., & Chapman, D. W. (1981). "Cloning" in Academia: Mentorship and Academic Careers. *Research in Higher Education,, 15*, 315-327.

Borko, H. (2004). Professional Development and Teacher Learning: Mapping the Terrain. *Educational Researcher, 88*(8), 3-15.

Brookfield, S. D. (1998). On the Certainty of Public Shaming: Working with Students Who Just Don't Get It. In C. Rust (Ed.), *Improving Students as Learners*. Oxford: OCSD.

Brooks, V. (1996). Mentoring: The Interpersonal Dimension. *Teacher Development, 5*(10).

Brouwer, N., & Korthagen, F. (2005). Can Teacher Education Make a Difference? . *American Educational Research Journal, 42*, 153-224.

Brown, L. M., & Gilligan, C. (1992). *Meeting at the Crossroads: Women's Psychology and Girls' Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bruner, J. (1999). Culture, Mind, and Education. In D. Moon & P. Murphy (Eds.), *Curriculum in Context*. London: Paul Chapman and the Open University.

Bryman, A. (1988). *Quantity and Quality in Social Research*. London: Unwin Hyman.

Bush, G. W. (2004). Education: The Promise of America: The White House, Washington, DC, US.

Bush, T., Coleman, M., Watt, D., & West-Burnam, J. (1996). Mentoring and Continuing Professional Development. In D. McIntyre & H. Hagger (Eds.), *Mentors in Schools*. London: David Fulton.

Byra, M. (1996). Post Lesson Conferencing Strategies and Preservice Teachers Reflective Practices. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 16*, 48-65.

Callahan, J. L., & Martin, D. (2007). The Spectrum of School–University Partnerships: A Typology of Organizational Learning Systems. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*, 136-145.

Camancho, A. S., & Fernandez-Balboa, J. M. (2006). Ethics, Politics and Bio-Pedagogy in Physical Education Teacher Education: Easing the Tension between the Self and the Group. *Sport, Education & Society, 11*(1), 1-20.

Cambridge Dictionaries Online. (2008). Research, *Cambridge Dictionaries Online*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cameron, L., & Jesser, P. (1992). Mentoring Can Add Extra Value to the Training Dollar. *Management Development*(April), 14-15.

Campbell, D. E., & Campbell, T. A. (2000). The Mentoring Relationship: Differing Perceptions of Benefits. *College Student Journal, 34*(4), 516-523.

Carr, W., & Kemmis, S. (1986). *Becoming Critical. Education, Knowledge and Action Research*. Lewes: Falmer.

Charmaz, K. (2000). Grounded Theory: Objectivist and Subjectivist Methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

Cheetham, G., & Chivers, G. (2001). How Professionals Learn in Practice: An Investigation of Informal Learning Amongst People Working in Professions. *Journal of European Industrial Education, 25*(5), 248-292.

Clark, C. M. (1988). Asking the Right Questions About Teacher Preparation: Contributions of Research on Teaching Thinking. *Educational Researcher, 17*(2), 5-12.

Claxton, G. (1999). *Wise Up. The Challenge of Lifelong Learning*. New York: Blomsbury Publishinig.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). 2005 Presidential Address the New Teacher Education: For Better for Worse,. *Educational Researcher, 34*(7), 3-17.

Coleman, M. M., & Mitchell, M. (2000). Assessing Observation Focus and Conference Targets of Cooperating Teachers. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 20*(1), 40-54.

Colwell, S. (1998). Mentoring, Socialization and the Mentor/Protégé Relationship. *Teaching in Higher Education, 3*(3), 313-324.

Committee for the Review of Teaching and Teacher Education. (2003). Australia's Teachers: Australia's Future Advancing Innovation, Science, Technology and Mathematics. In Department of Education Science and Training (Ed.): Australian Government.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of Experience and Narrative Inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 19*(5), 2-14.

Constantine, D. (1999). Findings in Words: Translation and Survival of the Human. In C.M. Clarke (Ed.), *Talking Shop: Authentic Conversation and Teacher Learning*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cook, T. D., & Campbell, D. T. (1979). *Quasi Experimentation: Design and Analytical Issues for Field Settings.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Coolahan, J. (2003a). *Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers: Country Background for Ireland.* Dublin: Department of Education & Science and the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development [OECD].

Coolahan, J. (2003b). Positioning the Teaching Career for the Knowledge Society, *SCOTENS Conference*. Malahide: Dublin.

Cooper, J. E. (1991). Telling Our Own Stories: The Reading and Writing of Journals and Diaries. In C. Witherell & N. Noddings (Eds.), *Stories Lives Tell: Narrative and Dialogue in Education*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Cothran, D., McCaughtry, N., Smigell, S., Garn, A., Kulinna, P., Martin, J. J., et al. (2008). Teachers' Preferences on the Qualities and Roles of a Mentor Teacher. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 27*, 241-251.

Cox, E. R. J. (2000). The Call to Mentor. *Career Development International, 5*(4), 202-210.

Cresswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational Research: Planning, Conducting, and Evaluating Quantitative and Qualitative Research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill-Prentice Hall.

Cronbach, L. A. (1980). *Toward Reform of Program Evaluation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cros, F., & Obin, J. P. (2003). *Attracting Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers: Country Background Report for France*: OECD.

Danielson, L. (2002). Developing and Retaining Quality Classroom Teachers through Mentoring. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearing House on Teaching and Teacher Education.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Teacher Learning That Supports Student Learning. *Educational Leadership, 55*(5), 6-11.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2005). Teaching as a Profession: International Lessons in Teacher Preparation and Professional Development. *Phi Delta Kappan, 87*(3), 237-240.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006a). Constructing 21st Century Teacher Education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 57*(3), 300-314.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006b). *Powerful Teacher Education: Lessons from Exemplary Programs*. SanFrancisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing Teachers for a Changing World:What Teachers Should Learn and Be Able to Do.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Day, C. (1998). Re-Thinking School–University Partnerships: A Swedish Case Study. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 14*(8), 807-819.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005a). Introduction. In N.K.Denzin & Y.S.Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Book of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). London Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005b). Paradigms and Perspectives in Contention. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 183- 190). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005c). Preface. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Department for Children Schools and Families. (2008). Every Child Matters: Department for Children Schools and Families, UK.

Department of Education and Science. (2006). *Modernisation of the Education and Training Systems Towards the 2010 Common Goals: Ireland.* Dublin: Ireland.

Devos, A. (2004). The Project of Self, the Project of Others: Mentoring, Women and the Fashioning of the Academic Subject. *Studies in Continuing Education, 26*(1), 67-80.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education. An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education (1966 Edn.)*. New York: Free Press.

Dobbin, S. A., & Gatowski, S. I. (1999). *A Judge's Deskbook on the Basic Philosopies and Methods of Science*. Nevada: State Justice Institute.

Dodds, P. (2005). Pete Women's Experiences of Being Mentored into Postsecondary Faculty Positions. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 24*, 344-367.

Doolittle, P. E. (1997). Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development as a Theoretical Foundation for Cooperation Learning. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching, 8*(1), 83-103.

Drucker, P. F. (1992). *The Age of Discontinuity: Guidelines to Our Changing Society*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Duncombe, R., & Armour, K. M. (2004). Collaborative Professional Development Learning: From Theory to Practice. *Journal of In-service Education, 30*(1), 141-166.

Eliot, T. S. (1961). *Selected Poems*. London: Faber & Faber.

Encyclopaedia Britannica. (2008). Fenelon, *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Chicago, Illinois: Encyclopaedia Britannica.

Eposito, L., & Murphy, J. W. (2000). Another Step in the Study of Race Relations. *The Sociological Quarterly, 41*(2), 171-187.

Erikson, E. H. (1963). *Childhood & Society*. New York: Norton.

Erikson, E. H. (1977). *Toys & Reasons*. New York: W.W. Norton.

European Union. (2001). *Making a European Area of Lifelong Learning a Reality*. Brussels: EU.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (1996). *Teacher Mentoring: A Critical Review*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearninghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 397060).

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann, M. (1985). Pitfalls of Experience in Teacher Preparation. *Teachers College Record,, 87*(1), 53-65.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Parker, M. B. (1993). Mentoring in Context: A Comparison of Two U.S. Programs for Beginning Teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research, 19*(699-718).

Fenwick, T. (1999). *Classifying Alternate Perspectives in Experiential Learning*. Retrieved 7th November 2005, from http://www.edst.educ.ubc.ca/aerc/1999/99fenwick.htm

Finlay, L. (2002). "Outing" The Researcher: The Provenance, Process, and Practice of Reflexivity. *Qualitative Health Research, 12*, 531-545.

Firestone, W. A. (1987). Meaning in Method: The Rhetoric of Quantitative and Qualitative Research. *Educational Researcher 16*(7), 16-21.

Fisher, D. (1993). *Communication in Organizations*. VA: Southwestern Educational Publications.

Fletcher, S. (1998). Attaining Self-Actualization through Mentoring. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 21*(21), 109-118.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2005). The Interview. In N.K.Denzin & Y.S.Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

Freebody, P. (2003). *Qualitative Research in Education: Interaction and Practice*. London: Sage.

Freire, P. (1998). *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy and Civic Courage Translated by Patrick Clark*. Lanaham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Fromm, E. (1956). *The Art of Loving*. New York: Harper & Row.

Fullan, M. (Ed.). (2005). *Fundamental Change*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Fuller, F. (1969). Conkers of Teachers: A Developmental Perspective. *Educational Reseach Journal, 6*, 207-226.

Furlong, J., & Maynard, T. (1995). *Mentoring Student Teachers: The Growth of Professional Knowledge*. London: Routledge.

Garrat, B. (1990). *Creating a Learning Organisation: A Guide to Leadership, Learning and Development*. England: Director Books.

Geertz, C. (2000). *Local Knowledge: Further Essays from Interpretive Anthropology* (2nd ed.). New York: Basic Books.

Germain, C. B., & Gitterman, A. (1987). Ecological Perspective. In A. Minahan (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Social Work* (18th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 488-499). Silverspring, MD: National Association of Social Workers.

Gerstein, M. (1985). Mentoring: An Age Old Practice in a Knowledge-Based Society. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 64*, 156-157.

Giblett, R. (1992). The Desire for Disciples. *Paragraph, 15*.

Ginsburg, M. (1988). *Contradictions in Teacher Education and Society: A Critical Analysis*. New York: Falmer Press.

Giroux, H. (1980). Teacher Education and the Ideology of Social Control. *Journal of Education, 162*(5-27).

Glaser, B. G. (1978). *Theoretical Sensitivity. Advances in the Methodology of Grounded Theory*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. (1967). *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. Chicago: Aldine.

Glickman, C. D., Gordon, S. P., & Ross-Gordon, J. M. (2001). *Supervision and Instructional Leadership* (5th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Gobo, G. (2005). The Renaissance of Qualitative Methods. *On-line Journal Forum:Qualitative Social Research, 6*(3).

Goffman, E. (1959). The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life. In D. Barton & K. Tusting (Eds.), *Beyond Communities of Practice: Language Power & Social Context*. London: Penguin.

Gorard, S. (2000). *Education and Social Justice: The Changing Composition of Schools and Its Implications*. Cardiff University of Wales Press,.

Gorard, S., Rushforth, K., & Taylor, C. (2004). Is There a Shortage of Quantitative Work in Education Research? *Oxford Review of Education, 30*(3), 371-395.

Graber, K. C. (1989). Teaching Tomorrows Teachers: Professional Preparation as an Agent of Socialisation. In T. J. Templin & P. G. Schempp (Eds.), *Socialization into Physical Education: Learning to Teacher*. Dubuque, IA: Brown & Benchmark.

Graham, G. (1988). Collaboration in Pe: A Lot Like Marriage. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 7*, 165-174.

Greene, M. (1967). *Existential Encounters for Teachers*. New York: Random House.

Greenwood, D. J., & Levin, M. (2005). Reform through Action Research. In N.K.Denzin & Y.S.Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions, and Emerging Confluences. In N.K.Denzin & Y.S.Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Book of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.

Guile, D., & Young, M. (1998). Apprenticeship as a Conceptual Basis for a Social Theory of Learning. *Journal of Vocational Education, 50*(2), 173-192.

Guillemin, M., & Gillam, L. (2004). Ethics, Reflexivity, and "Ethically Important Moments" in Research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 10*(2), 261-280.

Gulam, W., & Zulfiqar, M. (1998). Mentoring - Dr. Plum's Elixir and the Alchemists Stone. *Mentoring & Tutoring, 5*(3), 39-45.

Hammersley, M. (1989). *The Dilemma of Qualitative Method*. London: Routledge.

Hammersley, M., & Gomm, R. (2000). Introduction. In R. Gomm, M. Hammersley & P. Foster (Eds.), *Case Study Method*. London: Sage.

Haney, J. J., Czerniak, C. M., & Lumpe, A. T. (1996). Teacher Beliefs and Intentions Regarding the Implementation of Science Education Reform Strands. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 33*, 971-993.

Hanks, W. F. (1991). Foreword. In J. Lave & E. Wenger (Eds.), *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hardy, C. (1999). Preservice Teachers' Perceptions of Learning to Teach in a Predominantly School-Based Teacher Education Programme. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 18*, 175-198.

Hargreaves, D. H. (2001). A Capital Theory of School Effectiveness and Improvement. *British Educational Research Journal, 27*(4), 487-503.

Harris, J. (2000). Re-Visioning the Boundaries of Learning Theory in the Assessment of Prior Experiential Learning (Apel), *SCRUTEA 30th Annual conference*. University of Nottingham.

Harry, B., Sturges, K., & Klinger, J. (2005). Mapping the Process: An Exemplar of Process and Challenge in Grounded Theory Analysis. *Educational Researcher,, 34*(2), 3-13.

Healy, C. C., & Welchert, A. J. (1990). Mentoring Relations: A Defintion to Advance Research and Practice. *Educational Researcher, 19*(9), 17-21.

Heaney, T. (1995). *Learning to Control Democratically: Ethical Questions in Situated Adult Education.* Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 36th Annual Adult Education Research Conference Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta.

Herrington, J., & Oliver, R. (2000). An Instructional Design Framework for Authentic Learning Environments. *Educational Technology Research and Development, 48*(3), 23-48.

Holt-Reynolds, D. (2000). What Does the Teacher Do? Constructivist Pedagogies and Prospective Teachers' Beliefs About the Role of a Teacher'. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 16*, 21-32.

House, E. R. (1994). Integrating the Quantitative and Qualitative. In C. S. Reichardt & S. Rallis (Eds.), *The Qualitative-Quantitative Debate: New Perspectives*. San Francisco: Rosebays.

House, E. R. (2005). Changing Social Policy. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

Huberman, M. (1989). The Professional Lifecycle of Teachers. *Teachers College Record, 91*(1).

Hulley, S. B., & Cummings, S. R. (2006). *Designing Clinical Research.* Baltimore: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Hynes-Dussel, J. M. (1999). Co-Operating Teachers Perceptions About the Student Teaching Experience. *The Physical Educator 56*, 186-195.

Ingersoll, R. M., & Smith, T. M. (2004). Do Teacher Induction and Mentoring Matter? *NASSP Bulletin, 87*(638), 28-40.

Johnson, J. A. (2002). Japanese Education and Teacher Training in Transition. *Explorations in Teacher Education, 10*(2).

Johnson, L., Lee, A., & Green, B. (2000). The Phd and the Autonomous Self: Gender, Rationality and Postgraduate Pedagogy. *Studies in Higher Education, 25*(2).

Jonassen, D. H. (1995). Supporting Communities of Learners with Technology: A Vision for Integrating Technology with Learning in Schools. *Educational Technology, 35*(4), 60-63.

Kahan, D. (1999). Characteristics of and Explanations for Cooperating Teachers Immediate Supervisory Comments: A Pilot Study Using the Thinking-out-Loud Technique. *The Physical Educator, 56*, 126-137.

Kay, W. (2004). 'Are Mentors and Trainees Talking the Same Language? Understanding the Tenets and Requirements of the Ncpe 2000 in Relation to Subject Knowledge, Content Knowledge and Teaching and Learning in Physical Education'. *British Journal of Teaching Physical Education, 35*(3), 19-22.

Kemmis, S. (1980). The Imagination of the Case and the Invention of the Study. In H. Simons (Ed.), *Towards a Science of the Singular*. Norwich: CARE.

Kiely, E. (2005). *The Mentoring Phenomenon in Educating Pre-Service Science Teachers through School-Based Collaborative Partnership.* University of Limerick, Limerick.

Kirk, D., & Macdonald, D. (1998). Situated Learning in Physical Education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 17*, 376-387.

Kirk, G., & Broadhead, P. (2007). *Every Child Matters and Teacher Education: A Ucet Position Paper*. London: The Universities Council for the Education of Teachers.

Kirk, J., & Miller, M. L. (1986). *Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research.* London: Sage.

Klix, F. (1982). Are Learning Processes Evolutionary Invariant? An Unproved Assumption in Psychology of Learning Revisited. . *Zeitschrift für Psychologie, 190*, 381-391.

Kohler, W. (1947). *Gestalt Psychology : An Introduction to New Concepts in Modern Psychology*. New York: Liveright Pub. Corp.

Korthagen, F. A. J. (2001). *Linking Practice and Theory:The Pedgaogy of Realistic Teacher Education*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum associates.

Kram, K. E. (1985). *Mentoring at Work: Developmental Relationships in Organizational Life*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.

Kram, K. E., & Hall, D. (1995). Mentoring in the Context of Diversity and Turbulence. In E. Kossek & S. Lobel (Eds.), *Managing Diversity: Human Resources Strategies for Transforming Organisations*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Krieger, S. (1991). *Social Science and the Self: Personal Essays on an Art Form*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Kuhn, T. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning and Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge Press.

Lerman, S. (2000). The Social Turn in Mathematics Education Research. In J. Boaler (Ed.), *Multiple Perspectives on Mathematics Teaching and Learning* (pp. 19-44). Westport, CT: Ablex.

Levinson, D. (1978). *The Seasons of a Man's Life*. New York: Ballantyne Books.

Lewin, K. (1954). *Field Theory in Social Science.* . New York: Harper & Row.

Lewin, K. M. (2004). *The Preservice Training of Teachers: Does It Meet It's Objectives and How Can It Be Improved?* .

Lincoln, Y. S., & Cannella, G. S. (2004). Dangerous Discourses: Methodological Conservatism and Governmental Regimes of Truth. *Qualitative Inquiry, 10*, 5-14.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. New York: Sage.

Lissitz, R. W., & Samuelsen, K. (2007). A Suggested Change in Terminology and Emphasis Regarding Validity and Education. *Educational Researcher, 36*(8), 437-448.

Lombardi, J. (2001). Supervision of Student Teachers: Emerging Models and Innovative Approaches in the USA. *Teacher Development, 5*(3).

Long, J. (1997). The Dark Side of Mentoring. *Australian Educational Researcher, 24*(2), 115-133.

Lueddeke, G. R. (1999). Toward a Constructivist Framework for Guiding Change and Innovation in Higher Education. *The Journal of Higher Education, 70*(3), 235-260.

Maher, F., & Tetreault, M. (1992). Feminist Pedagogy and the Construction of Knowledge: One Teacher's Perspective. In H. Ansell & J. Wilkinson (Eds.), *On Teaching and Learning* (pp. 27-41). Cambridge, MA: Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning.

Mahew, H. (1985). *London Labour and the London Poor.* Londong: Penguin Books.

Malderez, A., Hobson, A. J., Tracey, L., & Kerr, K. (2007). Becoming a Student Teacher: Core Features of the Experience. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 30*(3), 225-248.

Manathunga, C. (2007). Supervision as Mentoring: The Role of Power and Boundary Crossing. *Studies in Continuing Education, 29*(2), 207-221.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1999). *Designing Qualitative Research.* London: Sage.

Martin, S. (1996). Support and Challenge: Conflicting or Complementary Aspects of Mentoring Novice Teachers. *Teachers and Teaching, 2*(1), 41-56.

Marzano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School Leadership That Works: From Research to Results.* Alexandria, VA: : Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.

Maslow, A. (1971). *The Farther Reaches of Human Nature.* New York: The Viking Press.

Mawer, M. (1996). *Mentoring in Physical Education: Issues and Insights.* UK: Falmer Press.

Maynard, T. (2001). The Student Teacher and the School Community of Practice: A Consideration of 'Learning as Participation'. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 31*(1), 39-52.

McCaughtry, N., Kulinna, P. H., Cothran, D., Martin, J., & Faust, R. (2005). Teachers Mentoring Teachers: A View over Time. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 24*, 326-343.

McCaughtry, N., & Rovegno, I. (2003). The Development of Pedagogical Content Knowledge: Moving from Blaming Students to Predicting Skillfulness, Recognising Motor Development and Understanding Emotion. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 22*, 355-368.

McCormick, J., & Barnett, K. (2006). Relationships between Teacher Career Stages/States and Locus of Control: A Multilevel Analysis, *Annual Conference of the Australian Association for Research in Education*. Adelaide.

McCullick, B. A. (2001). Practitioners Perspectives on Values, Knowledge and Skills Needed by Pete Participants. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 21*, 35-56.

McIntyre, D. J., Byrd, D. M., & Foxx, S. M. (1996). Field and Laboratory Experiences. In J. Sikula, T.J. Buttery & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education: A Project of the Association of Teacher Educators*. New York: Macmillan.

McLaughlin, M. W., & Talbert, J. E. (2001). *Professional Communities and the Work of High School Teaching*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

McWilliams, S., Cannon, P., Margaret Farrar, M., Tubbert, B., Connolly, C., & McSorley, F. (2006). Comparison and Evaluation of Aspects of Teacher Education in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. *European Journal of Teacher Education, 29*(1), 67-79.

Merriam, S. (1983). Mentors and Proteges: A Critical Review of the Literature. *Adult Education Quarterly, 33*, 161-173.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Merriam, S. B., Courtenay, B., & Baumgartner, L. (2003). On Becoming a Witch: Learning in a Marginalized Community of Practice. *Adult Education Quarterly, 53*, 170-188.

Metzler, M. W. (1990). *Instructional Supervision for Physical Education.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Mezirow, J. (1991). *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (2000). Learning to Think Like an Adult: Core Concepts of Transformational Theory. In *Learning as Transformation: Critical Perspectives on a Theory in Progress*
(pp. 3-33). San Franciso: Jossey Bass.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook. 2nd Edition.* . Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Miller, L., & Silvernail, D. L. (1994). Wells Junior High School: Evolution of a Professional Development School. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), *Professional*

Development Schools: Schools for Developing a Profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

Minichiello, V., Aroni, R., Timewell, E., & Alexander, L. (1995). *In-Depth Interviewing* (2nd ed.). Melbourne, Australia: Longman.

Ministry for Education Culture Sports Science and Technology (MEXT). (2005). *2005 White Paper on Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology*. Tokyo.

Morgan, D. L. (1997). *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Morgan, G. (1983). Research Strategies: Modes of Engagement. In G. Morgan (Ed.), *Beyond Method* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Morton-Cooper, A., & Palmer, A. (1993). *Mentoring & Preceptorship: A Guide to Support Roles in Clinical Practice*. Oxford: Blackwell Scientific.

Munhall, P. (1989). Philosophical Ponderings on Qualitative Research Methods in Nursing. *Nursing Science Quarterly,* 2(1), 20-28.

Myers, M. (2000). Qualitative Research and the Generalizability Question: Standing Firm with Proteus. , *The Qualitative Report* (Vol. 4).

National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (1995). *Initial Physical Education Teacher Education Standards*: NASPE.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (1989). *What Teachers Know and Should Be Able to Do*. Retrieved 18th March 2008, from http://www.nbpts.org/UserFiles/File/what_teachers.pdf

National Commission on Teaching and America's Future (NCTAF). (1996). What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future. New York: NCTAF.

Neill, J. (2007, 28 February 2007). *Qualitative Versus Quantitative Research: Key Points in a Classic Debate*, 2008

Neville, K. S., Sherman, R. H., & Cohen, C. E. (2005). *Preparing and Training Professionals: Comparing Education to Six Other Fields*: The Finance Project.

Newcombe, E. (1988). *Mentoring Programmes for New Teachers.* Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.

Newmann, F. M. (1994). *School-Wide Professional Community*. Madison, WI . Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, University of Wisconsin.

Nicholls, G. (1997). *Collaborative Change in Education*. London: Kogan Page.

O'Reilly, K. (2005). *Ethnographic Methods* (1st ed.). Oxon: Routledge.

O'Sullivan, M. (2003). Learning to Teach Physical Education. In S. J. Silverman & C. Ennis (Eds.), *Student Learning in Physical Education: Applying Research to Enhance Instruction*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

O'Leary, V., & Mitchell, J. (1990). Women Connecting with Women: Networks and Mentors. In S. Stiver-Lie & V. O'Leary (Eds.), *Storming the Tower: Women in the Academic World*. London: Kogan Page.

O'Reilly, M. R. (1998). *Radical Presence: Teaching as Contemplative Practice*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton, Cook, Heinemann.

Odell, S. J. (1990). Support for New Teachers in Mentoring. In M. Bey & C. T. Holmes (Eds.), *Mentoring: Developing Successful New Teachers*. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Office for National Statistics. (2001). *Social Capital: A Review of the Literature*. UK: Social Analysis and Reporting Division.

Oliver, K., & Lalik, R. (2000). *Bodily Knowledge:Learning About Equity and Justice with Adolescent Girls*. New York: Lang.

Online Etymological Dictionary. (2007). Mentoring, *Online Etymological Dictionary*.

Online Etymological Dictionary. (2008, 22nd April 2008). *Research*, from http://www.etymonline.com/index.php?search=research&searchmode=none

Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development. (2005). *Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers - Final Report: Teachers Matter.* Paris: OECD.

Otto, M. (1994). Mentoring: An Adult Development Perspective. In M. Wunsch (Ed.), *Mentoring Revisited: Making an Impact on Individuals and Institutions* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Palmer, J. (2001). *Fifty Modern Thinkers on Education: From Piaget to the Present.* London: Routledge.

Patton, K., Griffin, L. L., Sheehy, D., Arnold, R., Gallo, A., Pagnano, K., et al. (2005). Navigating the Mentoring Process in a Research-Based Teacher Development Project: A Situated Learning Perspective. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 24*(302-325).

Pidgeon, N., & Henwood, K. (2004). Grounded Theory. . In M. Hardy & A. Bryman (Eds.), *Handbook of Data Analysis*. London: Sage.

Pike, K. (1954). *Language in Relation to a Uni Ted Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior*. Santa Ana: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Placek, J. H. (1983). Conceptions of Success in Teaching: Busy, Happy, and Good? . In T. Templin & J. Olsen (Eds.), *Teaching in Physical Education* (pp. 45-56). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Polit, D., Beck, C., & Hungler, B. (2001). *Essentials of Nursing Research: Methods, Appraisal and Utliization*. Philadelphia: Lippincott.

Polit, D., & Hungler, B. (1991). *Nursing Research: Principles and Methods.* New York: JB Lippincott.

Popkewitz, T. (1985). Ideology and Social Formation in Teacher Education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 1*(91-107).

Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Ragins, B., & Cotton, J. (1999). Mentor Functions and Outcomes: A Comparison of Men and Women in Formal and Informal Mentoring Relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 84*(4), 529-550.

Randall, L. (1992). *Systematic Supervision for Physical Education.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Ratner, C. (2002). Subjectivity and Objectivity in Qualitative Methodology. *On-line Journal Forum:Qualitative Social Research, 3*(3).

Reohr, J. R. (1981). Mentor and Colleague Relationshipment Reproductive Service in Academia. *ERIC Document Reproductive Service No. ED 2 15 040.*

Resnick, L. (1994). Situated Rationalism: Biological and Social Preparation for Learning. In L. Hirschfeld & S. Gelman (Eds.), *Mapping the Mind: Domain Specificity in Cognition and Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richardson, L. (2000). Writing: A Method of Inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Richardson, L., & St. Pierre, E. A. (2005). Writing: A Method of Inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rikard, G. L., & Veale, M. L. (1996). Cooperating Teachers: Insight into Their Preparation, Beliefs and Practices. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 15*, 279-296.

Roberts, A. (2000). Mentoring Revisited: A Phenomenological Reading of the Literature. *Mentoring and Tutoring, 8*(2), 145-170.

Rossman, G., & Rallis, S. (1998). *Learning in the Field: An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Roth, W. M. (2004). Ethics as Social Practice: Introducing the Debate on Qualitative Research and Ethics [24 Paragraphs]. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research* (Vol. 6).

Rousmaniere, K. (2000). From Memory to Curriculum. *Teaching Education, 11*(1).

Rovegno, I. (2003). Teachers' Knowledge Construction. . In S. J. Silverman & C. D. Ennis (Eds.), *Student Learning in Physical Education* (2nd ed.). Champaign, Il: Human Kinetics.

Sandholtz, J. H. (2002). Inservice Training or Professional Development: Contrasting Opportunities in a School/University Partnership. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 18*(7), 815-830.

Sarup, M. (1996). *Identity, Culture and the Post-Modern World*. Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Savery, J., & Duffy, T. (1995). Problem-Based Learning: An Instructional Model and Its Constructivist Framework. *Educational Technology, 35*(5).

Schon, D. A. (1983). *The Reflective Practitioner*. New York: Basic Books.

Schwandt, T. A. (1997). *Qualitative Inquiry: A Dictionary of Terms*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sebren, A. (1994). Reflective Theory: Integrating Theory and Practice in Teacher Preparation. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 65*, 23-59.

Shulman, L. S. (1986). For Those Who Understand: Knowledge and Growth in Teaching. *Educational Researcher, 15*, 4-14.

Siedentop, D., & Tannehill, D. (2000). *Developing Teaching Skills in Physical Education*. Mountainview, CA: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Sikes, P. (1992). The Life Cycle of the Teacher. In S. Ball & F. Goodson (Eds.), *Teachers' Lives and Careers*. London: The Falmer Press.

Simons, P. R. J. (1993). Constructivist Learning: The Role of the Learner. In T.M. Duffy, J. Lowyck & D.H. Jonassen (Eds.), *Designing Environments for Constructive Learning*. London: Springer-Verlag.

Sireci, S. G. (2007). On Validity Theory and Test Validation. *Educational Researcher, 36*(8), 477-481.

Skilbeck, M., & Connell, H. (2003). *Attracting, Developing and Retaining Teachers: Australian Country Background Report*. Drysdale, Victoria: OECD.

Smith, M. K. (1999). *'Robert Putnam'*, from http://www.infed.org/thinkers/putnam.htm

Snape, D., & Spencer, L. (2003). The Foundations of Qualitative Research. In J. Ritchie & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitiative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Snowber, C. (2005). The Mentor as Artist: A Poetic Exploration of Listening, Creating and Mentoring. *Mentoring & Tutoring, 13*(3), 345-353.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). *Participant Observation* (1st ed.): Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Sprinthall, N. A., Reiman, A. J., & Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1996). *Teacher Professional Development*. New York: Macmillan.

Stake, R. E. (1980). The Case Method Inquiry in Social Inquiry. In H. Simons (Ed.). Norwich: CARE.

Stake, R. E. (2000). Case Studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Stake, R. E. (2005). Qualitative Case Studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Stidder, G., & Hayes, S. (2006). A Longitudinal Study of Physical Education Trainee Teachers' Experiences on School Placements in the South-East of England (1994–2004). *European Physical Education Review, 12*, 317-338.

Stigler, J. W., & Stevenson, H. W. (1991). How Asian Teachers Polish Each Lesson to Perfection. *American Educator, 15*(1), 12-21.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques*. Newbury, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. London: Sage.

Stroot, S., Keil, V., Stedman, P., Lohr, L., Faust, R., Schincariol-Randall, L., et al. (1998). Peer Assistance and Review Guidebook. Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education.

Stroot, S. A., Faucette, N., & Schwager, S. (1993). In the Beginning: The Induction of Physical Educators. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 12*(4), 375-385.

Tannehill, D., & Goc-Carp, G. G. (1992). The Student Teacher Practicum: Placement Trends and Issues. *The Physical Educator, 49*, 39-48.

Tasmanian Educational Leaders Institute. (2003). An Ethic of Care: Effective Programmes for Beginning Teachers. In Department of Education Tasmania (Ed.): Commonwealth Department of Education Science and Training Canberra.

Taylor, S. J., & Bogdan, R. (1984). *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.

Teddie, C., & Reynolds, D. (Eds.). (2000). *The International Handbook of School Effectiveness Research*. London Falmer.

Teitel, L. (1999). Looking toward the Future by Understanding the Past: The Historical Context of Professional Development Schools. *Peabody Journal of Education, 74*(3 & 4), 6-20.

Tellis, W. (1997). Introduction to Case Study, *The Qualitative Report* (Vol. 3).

Tennant, M., & Pogson, P. (1995). *Learning and Change in the Adult Years: A Developmental Perspective*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

The Teaching Council. (2007). Codes of Professional Conduct for Teachers: The Teaching Council, Ireland.

Thematic Network and Teacher Education Research. (2000). Green Paper on Teacher Education in Europe: High Quality Teacher Education for High Quality Education and Training: Sweden:Umea.

Tikunoff, W., Ward, B., & Lazar, C. (1980). Partners: Teachers, Researchers, Trainer/Developers—an Interactive Approach to Teacher Education in R& D. In G. Hall, S. Hord & G. Brown (Eds.), *Exploring Issues in Teacher Education: Questions for Future Research.* Austin: TX: The University of Texas R&D Center for Teacher Education.

Tishman, S., Jay, E., & Perkins, D. (1993). Teaching Thinking Dispositions: From Transmission to Enculturation. *Theory into Practice, 32*(3), 147-153.

Toma, J. D. (2000). How Getting Close to Your Subjects Makes Qualitative Data Better. *Theory into Practice, 39*(3), 177-184.

Tomlinson, P. D. (1989). Having It Both Ways: Hierarchical Focussing as a Research Interview Method. *British Educational Research Journal, 15*, 155-176.

Tomlinson, P. D. (1995). *Understanding Mentoring: Reflective Strategies for School-Based Teacher Preparation*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Tozer, S., & Horsley, H. (2006). Professional Development for Teachers in Physical Education: Where Are We Now? *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 25*, 450-457.

Training and Development Agency for Schools. (2008). *Becoming a Teacher.* Retrieved 20th May 2008, from http://www.tda.gov.uk/Recruit/becomingateacher.aspx

Trubowitz, S. (1986). Stages in the Development of School-College Collaboration. *Educational Leadership, 43*(5), 18-21.

Tsangaridou, N., & Siedentop, D. (1995). Reflective Teaching: A Literature Review. *Quest, 47*, 212-237.

United States Department of Education. (2004). No Child Left Behind: A Toolkit for Teachers. In US Department of Education (Ed.): ED Pubs, Education Publications Center, US Department of Education.

Van Der Mars, H. (2006). Time and Learning in Physical Education. In M. O' Sullivan, D. MacDonald & D. Kirk (Eds.), *The Handbook of Physical Education*. London: Sage.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. (Original work published 1934).

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Indentity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Werthner, P., & Trudel, P. (2006). A New Theoretical Perspective for Understanding How Coaches Learn to Coach. *The Sport Psychologist, 20*, 198-212.

What Works Clearing House. (2008a). *Overview*, from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/overview/index.asp

What Works Clearing House. (2008b). *Review Process*, from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/overview/review.asp?ag=pi

Wildemuth, B. (1993). Post-Positivist Research: Two Examples of Methodological Pluralism. *Library Quarterly,, 63*, 450-468.

Williams, A., & Soares, A. (2002). Sharing Roles and Responsibilities in Initial Teacher Training: Perceptions of Some Key Players. *Cambridge Journal of Education, 32*(1), 91-107.

Witz, K. G. (2007). "Awakening To" An Aspect in the Other: On Developing Insights and Concepts in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry, 13*, 235-258.

Wordnet. (2008a). *Partnership*, from http://wordnet.princeton.edu/perl/webwn

Wordnet. (2008b). *Vignette*. Retrieved 4th June 2008, from http://wordnet.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=vignette

Wubbels, T., Levy, J., & Brekelmans, M. (1997). Paying Attention to Relationships. *Educational Leadership, 54*(7), 82-86.

Wunsch, M. E. (1994). *Mentoring Revisited: Making an Impact on Individuals and Institutions*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Yamamoto, K. (1988). To See Life Grow: The Meaning of Mentorship. *Theory into Practice, 27*(3), 183-189.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case Study Research: Design and Methods* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.

Yin, R. K. (2004). *The Case Study Anthology*. London: Sage.

Youens, B., & McCarthy, S. (2007). Subject Knowledge Development by Science Student Teachers: The Role of University Tutors and School-Based Subject Mentors. *Research in Science & Technological Education, 25*(3), 293-306.

Zanting, A., Verloop, N., & Vermunt, J. D. (2003). Using Interviews and Concept Maps to Access Mentor Teachers Practical Knowledge. *Higher Education, 46*, 195-214.

Zukas, M. (2006). Pedagogic Learning in the Pedagogic Workplace: Educators Lifelong Learning and Learning Futures. *International Journal of Pedagogies and Learning, 2*(3), 71-80.

Appendices

Appendices

Appendix A: Presentation to PESS and EPS Departments

Presentation to
Graduate Diploma in Education
(Physical Education)
Course Board
Greendale University

Fiona C. Chambers
22nd June 2006

Draft research title

Developing PETE student teacher competence: An analysis of the role of teaching practice supervision

---

Area of research

Teaching Practice (TP) Supervision aims to develop student teacher competence:
"A set of professional teaching skills acquired by students as they practise teaching e.g. organizational skills, content knowledge, sequencing of subject matter, selection, use and production of media, a range of teaching methodologies, evaluation of processes and products of learning, disciplinary and reflective skills" (Brouwer & Korthagen, 2005).

Proposed research questions

1. How are PETE students supported to learn effectively during TP within the current model of supervision?
2. What is the nature of the PETE student learning that takes place?
3. How do teacher-mentors and university tutors view their roles and the nature of learning within current model of supervision?
4. How does school-based learning link to other strands of the teacher education programme in supporting student teacher competence?

Sub-questions A

1. What does international research literature say about learning, teacher learning and student teacher learning?
2. From international research literature, what is known about different models of learning and on what theories of learning are they based? How is mentoring framed within these theories of learning?
3. Which learning theories underpin ITE supervision models, internationally?

Sub-questions B

1. What are the theoretical underpinnings of the current model of supervision at Greendale University?
2. What are the roles of PETE student, mentor and university tutor in the current model?
3. What are the implications of a new model of TP supervision for PETE students, tutors and cooperating teachers?
4. What might a new model of TP supervision look like? On what theory of learning might it based?

Rationale for proposed research

What is a situative perspective?

- Movement from *cognitive learning theories*, (individual learners), to anthropological or *situative theories* (the social nature of learning)
- Learning to think is associated with increasing one's ability to participate effectively in the practices of a community (a collaborative social practice) (Barab & Duffy, 2000:26)

Using the situative perspective on teaching

- Borko (2004) suggests that *teacher professional learning and development* must be understood in multiple career-long learning situations and contexts, taking into account the *social systems in which teachers are participants.*
- "Located in communities of practice and occurring through 'legitimate peripheral participation' in those communities". (Lave & Wenger,1991)
- "Increasing participation in the practice of teaching, a process of becoming knowledgeable in and about teaching" (Adler, 2003).

Research from a Situative Perspective?

The researcher analyses "authentic conditions and activities in which the learners are participating". (Fenwick, 1999)

The 3 I's

Three distinct stages or 3 I's (Coolahan, 2004)

- Initial Teacher Training
- Induction
- In-service training (CPD)

Yet ITT, Induction and CPD should become a *seamless web of provision* (Hargreaves, 2000)

Framework for effective TP

A "constructive supportive and enlightening" TP experience depends on four key factors:

- How it is organised and supported,
- The mechanism of fusing theory with practice,
- Visits of university tutors (in the absence of trained mentors) and
- Timing and duration of TP (Lewin, 2004:12).

Principles for good quality TP

Brouwer & Korthagen (2005) corroborate Lewin's (2004) thoughts outlining three features of the teaching practice model are crucial. These principles can be adapted for use in this study in order to consider the nature of teaching practice supervision:

‡ Cyclical programming of college-based and student teaching periods

‡ Supporting individual learning processes

‡ Intensive cooperation between teacher educators

ITE in ROI

In ROI, Greendale University employ a 'block TP model' (Coolahan, 2004) in the four year PE degree programme

Cyclical programming of college-based and student teaching periods

Blocks of TP in Year One (four weeks), Year Two (ten weeks) and Year Four (ten weeks).

Supporting individual learning processes In Year One the PETE student is alone, Year Two dyads of students are assigned to schools and Year Four student is alone. No formal mentoring takes place.

Intensive cooperation between teacher educators No contact between cooperating teacher and university tutor takes place. Principal is not consulted on progress of the PETE student.

Limitations of Current Model of Teaching Practice

1. Contact is limited
2. Assessment based on a small number of visits
3. Fails to fully utilise experience and expertise of teachers and schools
4. Cooperating teachers and Principals often unclear about their role (Kiely, 2005)

Lucent Science Teacher Initiative (LSTI)

- Funded by Lucent Technologies Foundation K16 programme
- Founded in 2000
- Greendale University Colleges of Science and Education and 25 secondary schools
- Aim to develop initiate and evaluate new models for the professional training of teachers of science at second level in Ireland. (Kiely, 2005:87).

LSTI Model

- Triad: partnership with university, mentor/school and student teachers.
- Mentors received training at two summer schools pre and post probationary year through Process-Product Model (Rosenshine, 1987)
- Mentors become qualified as Lucent Mentor Teachers (LMT) and receive an honorarium and credits toward a Greendale University Master Degree course.
- Mentor has no formal role in assessment (Kiely, 2005).

National Pilot Project on Teacher Induction (ROI)

- Since 2002 partnership initiative (DES, Teachers Unions and University College Dublin)
- Two pillars:
  - Primary level induction
  - Second level induction
- Action research model
- Mentors (experienced teachers trained in local education centres for one school term)
- Principals have a pivotal role
- DES provide paid substitution

ITE in Graduate Diploma PE

Cyclical programming of college-based and student teaching periods

There is a sequence of four cycles (preparation/observation/one day per week teaching/seven week block of teaching).

‡ In Semester 1 the students will start their programme 3 weeks before schools are in session (i.e. before other Greendale University students)

‡ Students will then spend 3 weeks in schools observing the life of primary (?) schools at the start of a new school year. There is an opportunity to research the ethos of the school here.

‡ Students will then spend one day per week in schools throughout the semester in their triads/dyads.

‡ In Semester 2, students will undertake a 7-week TP block (mid January until early March 2007).

ITE in the UK

Cyclical programming of college-based and student teaching periods

Teacher training takes place over one year as follows:

Phase One

‡ Two weeks in Primary school for observation

‡ Two weeks in University

‡ Four weeks (Two days in school/three in university)

‡ Ten weeks block practice

‡ One week in University

Phase Two

‡ Three weeks (Two days in school/three in university)

‡ Eleven weeks block practice

‡ Three weeks university

UK continued...

Supporting individual learning processes

University is linked to Partner Schools (PS). Each PS is remunerated for its involvement in the programme. Therefore, every PS has an ITE coordinator who supervises ITE in the school ensuring that quality teacher training occurs. He/she co-ordinates subject mentors, linking them with the PETE students and all the while ensuring that quality mentoring is in place. PETE students are placed in pairs in schools during TP.

UK continued...

Intensive cooperation between teacher educators

University visiting tutor monitors quality of the school's teacher training programme including mentoring standards. He/she will also evaluate the PETE student formally in consultation with the subject mentor and the PETE students, themselves.

ITE in Netherlands

- Three years university followed by one year of training
- Schools vary in how mentors are selected (burnt out teachers or excellent practitioners)

- Mentors get time reduction and a salary that reflects the responsibility but no pay rise.
- Mentors trained by ENCO in social skills and in competencies
- Mentors under the guidance of a 'super mentor'
- Half day per week for mentee debriefing
- Mentor helps mentee to self-assess/reflect
- University tutor evaluates mentee
- Lack of connection between theory and practice

(Koopman and Lakerfeld, 2005)

Another example...

Cyclical programming of college-based and student teaching periods
Supporting individual learning processes
Triad of PETE students in each school to allow more opportunities to observe, feedback and try out new ideas.
Each triad linked with cooperating teacher who supervises the triad analysis of each lesson using a clinical supervision format. This encourages reflection.
Intensive cooperation between teacher educators leading to a fusion between theory and practice (Brouwer and Korthagen, 2005)

Proposed research methodology

Design of Study Methodology

Qualitative in nature within a case study framework

Evaluation of current model of TP supervision
Ballinkay Region Triads [student teacher dyad, cooperating teacher and PESS/EPS tutor]
Ballinty Region Triads [student teacher dyad, cooperating teacher and PESS/EPS tutor]
Ballinboy Region Triads [student teacher dyad, cooperating teacher and PESS/EPS tutor]

Data collection methods

Theory of Change Logic Model (Weiss 1995)
Structures evaluation of the design and effectiveness of the programme
Qualitative Data Collection Methods
- Using the Theory of Change Logic Model framework.
- A range of qualitative data collection methods will be employed: (Focus groups, Interviews, E-journals)

Theory of Change Logic Model (Weiss, 1995)
Step 1 – Formation of Basic Logic Model
(Resources, Activities, Outputs, short term and long term Outcomes, Impact)
Step 2 – Expand to explain Theory of Change that describes programme rationale
Step 3 – Use expanded model to inform thinking about evaluation and success indicators

LOGIC MODEL

- Data analysis
- Grounded theory will be employed for analysing the data.
- Categories and concepts are developed systematically from the data and are linked to substantive and formal theories (Pidgeon & Henwood, 2004).
- Different stages of data analysis
- Ideas to explore with
  PETE students, tutors,
  and cooperating teachers

Mentor Support Group

"Stronger liaison between mentors" (Kiely, 2005:325)

Virtual teams
Groups of geographically distributed people working on interdependent tasks and sharing joint responsibility for team outcomes (Majchrzak & Malhotra, 2003:7)

Far-flung teams
Teams of individuals spread across the globe, working collaboratively to innovate, with minimal or no face-to-face contact (Majchrzak & Malhotra, 2003:7)

Resources Available

- Instant messaging: MSN messenger (free)
- Discussion fora:
  - Google Groups Beta (free)
  - Groups.yahoo.com (free)
- Virtual library e.g.Charles Sturt University, Australia

Research outcomes

The *Researcher* will:

- Have an opportunity to conduct a literature review on teacher education and models of supervision.
- Evaluate the effectiveness of the current model of TP supervision using a Theory of Change Logic Model (Weiss, 1995) and share findings with relevant professional colleagues.
- Collaborate with relevant professional colleagues on the development of a new model of TP supervision.
- Use this work to gain her PhD qualification

The *PESS and EPS dept* will:

- Have the additional resource of a researcher who will evaluate the current model of TP supervision and collaborate on the development of the new model of TP supervision.

- Be provided with regular research summaries (quarterly or as required) and a final evaluation report which will summarise the effectiveness of the current model of TP supervision and put forward a new model of TP supervision for the Graduate Diploma.

Cooperating ***Teachers*** **will:**

- Enhance their own professional learning by engaging with the researcher, tutors and students in a critically analytical research process
- Have an opportunity to reflect on their role within the TP supervision model.
- Provide documented feedback on the experience of having informal role in PETE student guidance within the current model of TP supervision.
- Help to inform the development of a new model of TP supervision.

PETE ***Students*** **will:**

Have the opportunity to...

- Critically reflect upon the ways in which the mentor role in the current supervision model impacts their learning.
- Consider their own learning within the context of a wider research project.
- Inform the future shape of TP supervision

Appendix B: Covering and Consent Letters

Consent Form

I understand that my participation in this study is strictly voluntary and I may discontinue participation at any time, without prejudice. I understand that the purpose of this study is to evaluate how the physical education teaching practice experience supports and develops key aspects of PETE student teacher learning and development i.e. the knowledge, skills and dispositions needed to be an effective teacher.

I further understand that any information about individual participants that is collected during this study will be held in the strictest confidence and will not be part of a permanent record. I understand that in order for the research to be effective and valuable, certain personal identifiers need to be collected. I also understand that the strictest confidentiality will be maintained throughout this study, and that only the researchers will have access to the confidential information. I understand that at the conclusion of this study, all records that identify individual participants will be destroyed. I am aware that I have not and am not, waiving any legal or human rights by agreeing to this participation.

By signing below, I verify that I agree to and understand the conditions listed above.

Signature: _____Date:_____

Name in block capitals: _____

XXXX
XXXX
XXXX
XXXX

21st August 2006

Dear X [Cooperating Teacher]

I am a doctoral student at Loughborough University, United Kingdom, currently studying the role of teaching practice (TP) supervision in helping Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) student teachers learn to teach. Therefore, from August 2006, I plan to study the TP supervision process in the Graduate Diploma in Education (Physical Education) at the Greendale University (GU) and how it impacts on the development of student teachers as new teachers.

The study has *two* key aims:

(1) To evaluate the impact of existing practices of teaching practice supervision at the Greendale University on PETE student teachers learning using a Theory of Change Logic Model (TOCLM) (Weiss, 1995).
(2) To use literature, Irish policy context and data gathered from Physical Education and Sports Sciences (PESS) tutors and Education and Professional Studies tutors to inform the development of a model of TP supervision.

In this study, learning to teach refers to a set of professional teaching skills, knowledge and dispositions developed by students as they practise teaching e.g. organisational skills, content knowledge, sequencing of subject matter, knowledge of the student, selection, use and production of media and a range of teaching methodologies in support of student learning, disciplinary and reflective skills (Brouwer & Korthagen, 2005). Within the TOCLM framework, the nature and quality of PETE student learning during and after TP will be mapped qualitatively and then analysed using a grounded theory approach (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

To this end, I will gather qualitative data from university tutors, cooperating teachers, PETE students and participating school principals in the form of interviews about existing TP supervision practices. The identity of all informants will be protected through the use of pseudonyms.

It is intended that all participants in this study will have an opportunity to reflect on current TP supervision practices and to therefore inform the creation of a model of teaching practice that may meet the needs of students, tutors and cooperating teachers and school principals.

I am writing to ask if you might be willing to allow me to observe and learn from your work in the following ways:

Action	Time required as given within the Grad Dip Programme
Researcher will conduct: • Interview during '3 week observation'	30mins (researcher and cooperating teacher only)
• Initial and endpoint interviews during '1 day per week TP'	2x30mins (researcher and cooperating teacher only)
• Initial, midpoint and endpoint interviews during '7 week TP block'	3x30mins (researcher and cooperating teacher only)
• Observation of one lesson and post lesson debriefing during '3 week observation'	2 hours (researcher, cooperating teacher and student teacher)
• Observation of one lesson and post lesson debriefing at initial and endpoint during '1 day per week TP'	3x2hours (researcher, cooperating teacher and student teacher)
• Observation of lesson and post lesson debriefing at initial, midpoint and endpoint during 7 week TP block'	3x2hours(researcher, cooperating teacher and student teacher)

If you feel you are willing to be part of this study, please read, sign and return the attached 'Informed Consent Form' to the above address.

Thanking you for you kind attention to this matter.

I look forward to hearing from you, in due course,

Yours sincerely,

Fiona Chambers

XXXX
XXXX
XXXX
XXXX

21st August 2006

Dear X [PETE student]

I am a doctoral student at Loughborough University, United Kingdom, currently studying the role of teaching practice (TP) supervision in helping Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) student teachers learn to teach. Therefore, from August 2006, I plan to study the TP supervision process in the Graduate Diploma in Education (Physical Education) at the Greendale University (GU) and how it impacts on the development of student teachers as new teachers.

The study has *two* key aims:

(3) To evaluate the impact of existing practices of teaching practice supervision at the Greendale University on PETE student teachers learning using a Theory of Change Logic Model (TOCLM) (Weiss, 1995).
(4) To use literature, Irish policy context and data gathered from Physical Education and Sports Sciences (PESS) tutors and Education and Professional Studies tutors to inform the development of a model of TP supervision.

In this study, learning to teach refers to a set of professional teaching skills, knowledge and dispositions developed by students as they practise teaching e.g. organisational skills, content knowledge, sequencing of subject matter, knowledge of the student, selection, use and production of media and a range of teaching methodologies in support of student learning, disciplinary and reflective skills (Brouwer & Korthagen, 2005). Within the TOCLM framework, the nature and quality of PETE student learning during and after TP will be mapped qualitatively and then analysed using a grounded theory approach (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

To this end, I will gather qualitative data from university tutors, cooperating teachers, PETE students and participating school principals in the form of interviews about existing TP supervision practices. The identity of all informants will be protected through the use of pseudonyms.

It is intended that all participants in this study will have an opportunity to reflect on current TP supervision practices and to therefore inform the creation of a model of teaching practice that may meet the needs of students, tutors and cooperating teachers:

I am writing to ask if you might be willing to allow me to observe and learn from your work in the following ways:

Action	Time already assigned within the Grad Dip Programme
Researcher will conduct:	
• Observation of week one induction (21st August 2006)	1 day
• Analysis of weekly lesson observations	
• Initial, endpoint observation of students during '3 week observation of classes'	2x2hour per student
• Attendance at post TP debriefing by student	1 hour
• Initial, midpoint and endpoint observation of students lesson and post lesson debriefing during '1 day per week TP'	3x 2 hour per student
• Attendance and post TP debriefing with student	1 hour
• Initial, midpoint and endpoint observation of students lesson and post lesson debriefing during '7 week teaching practice'	3x 2hours per student
• Attendance at post TP debriefing with student	1 hour
• Initial, midpoint and endpoint interviews with students during '3 week observation of classes'	3x 30mins per student
• Initial, midpoint and endpoint interviews with students during '1 day per week TP'	3x 30mins per student
• Initial, midpoint and endpoint interviews with students during '7 week teaching practice'	3x30mins per student

If you feel you are willing to be part of this study, please read, sign and return the attached 'Informed Consent Form' to the above address.

Thanking you for you kind attention to this matter.

I look forward to hearing from you in due course,

Yours sincerely,

Fiona Chambers

XXXX
XXXX
XXXX
XXXX

21st August 2006

Dear X [School Principal]

I am a doctoral student at Loughborough University, United Kingdom, currently studying the role of teaching practice (TP) supervision in helping Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) student teachers learn to teach. Therefore, from August 2006, I plan to study the TP supervision process in the Graduate Diploma in Education (Physical Education) at the Greendale University (GU) and how it impacts on the development of student teachers as new teachers.

The study has *two* key aims:

(5) To evaluate the impact of existing practices of teaching practice supervision at the Greendale University on PETE student teachers learning using a Theory of Change Logic Model (TOCLM) (Weiss, 1995).
(6) To use literature, Irish policy context and data gathered from Physical Education and Sports Sciences (PESS) tutors and Education and Professional Studies tutors to inform the development of a model of TP supervision.

In this study, learning to teach refers to a set of professional teaching skills, knowledge and dispositions developed by students as they practise teaching e.g. organisational skills, content knowledge, sequencing of subject matter, knowledge of the student, selection, use and production of media and a range of teaching methodologies in support of student learning, disciplinary and reflective skills (Brouwer & Korthagen, 2005). Within the TOCLM framework, the nature and quality of PETE student learning during and after TP will be mapped qualitatively and then analysed using a grounded theory approach (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

To this end, I will gather qualitative data from university tutors, cooperating teachers, PETE students and participating school principals in the form of interviews about existing TP supervision practices. The identity of all informants will be protected through the use of pseudonyms.

It is intended that all participants in this study will have an opportunity to reflect on current TP supervision practices and to therefore inform the creation of a model of teaching practice that may meet the needs of students, tutors and cooperating teachers:

I am writing to ask if you might be willing to allow me to observe and learn from your work in the following ways:

Action	Time already given within the Grad Dip Programme
Researcher will conduct: • Initial, midpoint and endpoint interview to understand your views on the role of the principal, school, cooperating teacher in supporting teaching practice	3x30mins per interview (one in each of the following months: September 06, January 07 and March 07)

If you feel you are willing to be part of this study, please read, sign and return the attached 'Informed Consent Form' to the above address.

Thanking you for you kind attention to this matter.

I look forward to hearing from you in due course,

Yours sincerely,

Fiona Chambers

XXXX
XXXX
XXXX
XXXX

21st August 2006

Dear X [Tutor]

I am a doctoral student at Loughborough University, United Kingdom, currently studying the role of teaching practice (TP) supervision in helping Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) student teachers learn to teach. Therefore, from August 2006, I plan to study the TP supervision process in the Graduate Diploma in Education (Physical Education) at the Greendale University (GU) and how it impacts on the development of student teachers as new teachers.

The study has *two* key aims:

(7) To evaluate the impact of existing practices of teaching practice supervision at the Greendale University on PETE student teachers learning using a Theory of Change Logic Model (TOCLM) (Weiss, 1995).
(8) To use literature, Irish policy context and data gathered from Physical Education and Sports Sciences (PESS) tutors and Education and Professional Studies tutors to inform the development of a model of TP supervision.

In this study, learning to teach refers to a set of professional teaching skills, knowledge and dispositions developed by students as they practise teaching e.g. organisational skills, content knowledge, sequencing of subject matter, knowledge of the student, selection, use and production of media and a range of teaching methodologies in support of student learning, disciplinary and reflective skills (Brouwer & Korthagen, 2005). Within the TOCLM framework, the nature and quality of PETE student learning during and after TP will be mapped qualitatively and then analysed using a grounded theory approach (Strauss & Corbin, 1998).

To this end, I will gather qualitative data from university tutors, cooperating teachers, PETE students and participating school principals in the form of interviews about existing TP supervision practices. The identity of all informants will be protected through the use of pseudonyms.

It is intended that all participants in this study will have an opportunity to reflect on current TP supervision practices and to therefore inform the creation of a model of teaching practice that may meet the needs of students, tutors and cooperating teachers:

I am writing to ask if you might be willing to allow me to observe and learn from your work in the following ways:

Action	Time already given within the Grad Dip Programme
Researcher will conduct: • Observation of initial meeting with student • One interview during 3 week observation [maybe by phone] • Attendance at post TP debriefing with a student • Initial, midpoint and endpoint interview during '1 day per week TP [maybe by phone] • Attendance at post TP debriefing by student • Observation of lesson of a student at initial and endpoint during '3 week observation' • Observation of lesson and post lesson debriefing at initial, midpoint and endpoint during '1 day per week TP' • Observation of lesson and post lesson debriefing at initial, midpoint and endpoint during '7 week TP block' • Delivery of findings at September 2007 meeting to all tutors	 1 hour per tutor plus student 30 mins 1 hour 3x30mins 1 hour 2x2hours per student 3x2 hours per student 3x2hours per student 2 hours

If you feel you are willing to be part of this study, please read, sign and return the attached 'Informed Consent Form' to the above address.

Thanking you for you kind attention to this matter.

I look forward to hearing from you in due course,

Yours sincerely,

Fiona Chambers

Appendix C: Open Profile Questionnaires

Questionnaire for Cooperating Teachers

1. Name
2. Age
3. School
4. Second teaching subjects

5. Hobbies?
   How did you become interested in these hobbies?

6. Why did you become a teacher?

7. Has this motivation changed during your career?

8. How long have you been teaching?

9. What is high quality physical education?

10. How do you try to reach and offer high quality PE?

11. What is an effective PE teacher?

12. What are the factors that affect teachers' work and effectiveness?

13. What is an ineffective PE teacher? Please give reasons for your answer

14. How long have you been a cooperating teacher/mentor?
15. Have you had any training to help you in this role? Please give details?

16. In your own teaching practice (TP), did you have a cooperating teacher/mentor?If so give details of the impact of this person on your teaching?

17. If you were to use a metaphor to describe the relationship between cooperating teacher/mentor and student teacher, what would it be and why?

18. In your opinion what are the key qualities and skills required to be a cooperating teacher/mentor?

19. Outline your current day to day duties as a cooperating teacher/mentor?

20. Outline the impact of the TP supervision experience on you as a mentor? What are the benefits and problems of being a mentor?

21. How effective are the current assessment procedures of TP?

22. In your opinion what is the current role of the cooperating teacher/mentor in TP assessment

23. How might mentors be rewarded for their work?

PETE Student Questionnaire

This questionnaire is divided into a number of key sections which relate to your Induction Training.

Background information
Qualifications:

Work Experience to date:

Hobbies/Interests:

Membership of Professional Associations:

Why did you decide to apply for this course?

Why do you think you were successful at interview for this course?

What is your view of the role of a mentor in teaching?

In your experience to date, have you had a mentor? Can you outline the context for this? What key skills did you learn from this mentor?

Teaching Metaphor Assignment

What was your metaphor for teaching during your Induction Week?

Has this changed in any way since you started your observation period?

Did you find this exercise relevant to your preparation for teaching? If so, why?

Community Mapping Assignment

Name some interesting information you have gathered about your school's community?

How does the school actively link with the community to promote a healthy lifestyle within its student population?

Describe an interaction with a local person which encouraged you to reflect on your philosophy of teaching?

How might this exercise prepare you for your role as a teacher?

Student Shadowing Assignment

Describe the student you have chosen to shadow?

How does he/she differ from you?

How do you think he/she learns?

From your observations, which teaching style appears to support this student's learning?

Teacher Shadow

Describe the teaching style of the teacher you have chosen to observe?

How does he/she view the role of the teacher?

What are the challenges that they see in today's classroom?

How does he/she interact with the students?

What aspects of teaching do they find most enjoyable?

And most frustrating...

What is his/her relationship with his/her colleagues?

How does your teaching metaphor compare to this teacher's metaphor?

Rules, Routines and Expectations Assignment

Outline the rules, routines and expectations you have chosen to guide student behaviour in your classroom...

Rules_____

Routines_____

Expectations_____

Rationale:
Open Profile Questionnaire Cooperating teachers

Category	Question	Rationale
Background	Name	Demographics
Background	Age	Demographics
Background	School	Demographics
Pedagogical and content knowledge of wider range, transferability of skills...	Second teaching subjects	Link with PE, crossover, opportunity to apply a variety of teaching methods, wider skill base
Personal history, prior knowledge. To gain fuller picture of the mentor	Hobbies? How did you become interested in these hobbies?	Link with mentoring to see how they became interested in hobby and if they work as mentor within the context of hobby
Teaching Philosophy	Why did you become a teacher? Has this motivation changed during your career?	To obtain an understanding of how basic philosophy of teaching has evolved
Teaching experience – pedagogical and content knowledge	How long have you been teaching?	Expert vs novice teacher
Quality PE	What is high quality physical education? How do you try to reach and offer high quality PE?	To explore their view of quality PE.
Effective PE teaching	What is an effective PE teacher? What are the factors that affect teachers' work and effectiveness? What is an ineffective PE teacher? Please give reasons for your answer.	To understand their concept of effective PE teaching.
Mentoring	How long have you been a	Expert vs novice

experience	cooperating teacher/mentor?	mentor
Training for Mentoring	Have you had any training to help you in this role? Please give details?	To gain an understanding of level of preparation for this role
Mentee experiences	In your own teaching practice (TP), did you have a cooperating teacher/mentor?If so give details of the impact of this person on your teaching?	Link with personal history and how this experience may influence philosophy of mentoring
Mentoring philosophy	If you were to use a metaphor to describe the relationship between cooperating teacher/mentor and student teacher, what would it be and why?	Using a metaphor sometimes gives a clearer picture of the philosophy of mentoring

Mentoring skills	In your opinion what are the key qualities and skills required to be a cooperating teacher/mentor?	To make a link with the philosophy of mentoring...
Mentoring Duties	Outline your current day to day duties as a cooperating teacher/mentor?	To see if 'mentoring' is a more surface or 'deep' act
Mentoring, Mentor and mentee as colearners	Outline the impact of the TP supervision experience on you as a mentor? What are the benefits and problems of being a mentor?	To give them an opportunity to reflect on the impact of the relationship on them...
Mentor role in assessment	How effective are the current assessment procedures of TP?	To gain insight into whether assessment matches the aims of TP
Mentor role in assessment	In your opinion what is the current role of the cooperating teacher/mentor in TP assessment?	To tap into how important they perceive the mentoring role in TP. Does it matter that they do not have a voice in assessment
Mentoring remuneration	How might mentors be rewarded for their work?	It is clear that in the current educational climate in ROI,

		mentors are not rewarded for their work...This question opens the issue up for argument...

Appendix D: 1st Interview Questionnaire

Research Question:

An analysis of learning in action: a joint analysis with mentor and mentee about the ways in which learning is taking place as it happens and the different ways in which the parties engage in order to promote learning....

(a) To understand the nature of PETE student teacher learning?
(b) How do PETE student teachers learn how to teach?

Interviews with Cooperating teachers and student teachers – An Agenda

Interview 1
[Three parts – pre lesson, during lesson and post lesson]

The purpose of the first interview with the cooperating teachers and student teacher will be:

1. To explore how the student teacher has planned the lesson, how she has been supported in doing this and what are her hopes and fears going into the class.
2. To investigate what the mentor might hope to see in the lesson and how he/ she helped the student teacher to learn about these issues
3. To observe the lesson linking this to the cooperating teacher and student teacher responses to pre lesson interview.
4. To observe the interaction between cooperating teacher and student teacher in the post lesson phase, specifically looking at how the cooperating teacher helps the student teacher to learn, identifies what, how and why she needs to learn following on from this lesson.
5. To understand whether the cooperating teacher and the student teacher have a shared philosophy of teaching and whether they have articulated this in their recent conversations.

Key questions and prompts
[Pre lesson]

Student Teacher

Can you describe what you are going to do in today's lesson?

i. Aim
ii. Objectives
iii. Content
iv. Assessment

Why have chosen to do this?

Where did you learn how to plan a lesson in this way?
In relation to this lesson, what are you most worried about?
Describe what you hope will happen in this lesson?

Mentor

Can you outline what you hope to see in this lesson?
How has the learning on... been supported to date?
Why do you think that particular method of support has been helpful to this student teacher's development?

During lesson

Observation of lesson using prompts from student pre-lesson interview...

- Aim
- Objectives
- Content
- Assessment

In relation to this lesson, what are they most worried about?
Describe what they hope will happen in this lesson?

[Post lesson]

Listen to post lesson analysis by cooperating teacher and student teacher to see how mentor attempts to help student teacher learn.

a. How do they introduce the critique? Focus on positive or negative aspects?
b. What are the key observations?
b. What language is used?
c. What is the body language of both parties?
d. How does the student teacher respond?
e. What does the cooperating teacher want the student to learn in order to improve next weeks lesson?

Specifically query the cooperating teacher and student teacher regarding the success of the lesson...

a. What were your goals for this lesson?
   Describe the process of planning the lesson...how was this process guided?
   What did you want the pupils to learn as a result of this lesson?
b. Do you believe you were successful in achieving these goals?
   Why do you believe that?
c. What do you believe pupils learned in this lesson? Was there unplanned learning?

Student teacher learning

a. What/How/Why did the student teacher learn?
   i. What did the student teacher learn? How did they learn it? Why?
   ii. What might the student teacher need to learn next? Why? How?

Personal philosophies of teaching PE

a. You said that high quality PE is...how do you try to reach and offer high quality PE?
b. You said that an effective PE teacher is...what are the factors that affect teachers' work and effectiveness?
c. You said that an ineffective PE teacher is... Why do you believe that?
d. What kind of teacher does the mentor want the student teacher to be? Why?
e. What kind of teacher does the student teacher want to be? Why?
f. Do these philosophies match?
g. Have you discussed your personal philosophies with each other before? Why?/Why not?

Appendix E: 2nd Interview Questionnaire

Research Question:

An analysis of learning in action: a joint analysis with cooperating teacher and student teacher about the ways in which learning is taking place as it happens and the different ways in which the parties engage in order to promote learning....

(a) To understand the nature of PETE student teacher learning?
(b) How do PETE student teachers learn how to teach?

Second Interview with cooperating teachers and student teachers – An Agenda

Interview 2
[Three parts – pre lesson, during lesson and post lesson]

The purpose of the second interview with the cooperating teachers and student teacher will be:

1. To build on previous data collection in phase two to gain a deeper insight into the nature of PETE student teacher learning and how they learn to teach.
2. To explore how the student teacher has planned the lesson, how she has been supported in doing this and what are her hopes and fears going into the class/has the focus changed from being organizational and discipline centred?/why or how has this changed?
3. To gain an understanding of how the PETE student teacher perceives her working relationship with her cooperating teacher/are they on a par?/is there a perceived hierarchy?/ does she feel safe to express her opinions?
4. To investigate how the student teacher feels and values about being observed and critiqued during lesson/how is criticism viewed?/Constructive or destructive?
5. To understand the student teacher's perception of the role of the cooperating teacher/ Is he/she a facilitator/dictator?
6. To investigate what the cooperating teacher might hope to see in the lesson and how he/she helped the student teacher to learn about these issues/ is the focus on management of learning environment or on the learner?
7. To observe the lesson linking this to the cooperating teacher and student teacher responses to pre and post lesson interviews.
8. To observe the interaction between cooperating teacher and student teacher in the post lesson phase, specifically looking at how the cooperating teacher helps the student teacher to learn, identifies what, how and why she needs to learn following on from this lesson/ Is this constructive?/ How is it framed?/ What suggestions are made to improve practice/ Are there links to theory?
9. To understand how the teaching philosophy of the cooperating teacher and the student teacher have evolved in the intervening period/ have they discussed their views?/Has anything changed in the intervening period?

Key questions and prompts
[Pre lesson]

Student Teacher

Describe three changes in your teaching strategy you since the last interview?

How did this evolve?

Who instigated it?

Can you describe what you are going to do in today's lesson?

- Aim
- Objectives
- Content
- Assessment

Why have chosen to do this? Have you had support in planning this lesson? Describe nature of support?

In relation to this lesson, what are you most worried about?

Describe what you hope will happen in this lesson?

Has this changed since we last spoke?

Cooperating Teacher

Can you outline what you hope to see in this lesson?

How has the learning on... been supported to date?

Why do you think that particular method of support has been helpful to this student teacher's development?

Can you outline if and how this student's teaching style has changed in the past few weeks? How has this evolved? Who has influenced this change?

How do think the student teacher's perceives your role? Is she open to appraisal?

During lesson

Observation of lesson using prompts from student pre-lesson interview...

- Aim
- Objectives
- Content
- Assessment

In relation to this lesson, what are they most worried about?

Describe what they hope will happen in this lesson?

Are their hopes and fears valid? Are they focused on the learner or on management issues?

[Post lesson]

Listen to post lesson analysis by cooperating teacher and student teacher to see how mentor attempts to help student teacher learn.

How do they introduce the critique?

Focus on positive or negative aspects?

What are the key observations?

What language is used?

What is the body language of both parties?

How does the student teacher respond?

Is student teacher allowed to respond?

e. What does the cooperating teacher want the student to learn in order to improve next weeks lesson?

Is it a learner focus or a management focus?

Are there links to theory?

Specifically query the cooperating teacher and student teacher regarding the success of the lesson...

a. What were your goals for this lesson?

i. Describe the process of planning the lesson...how was this process guided?

ii. What did you want the pupils to learn as a result of this lesson?

b. Do you believe you were successful in achieving these goals?

Why do you believe that?

c. What do you believe pupils learned in this lesson?

Was there unplanned learning?

d. How have your goals changed in the last number of weeks?

What has influenced this change? (If applicable)

Student teacher learning

a. What/How/Why did the student teacher learn?

What did the student teacher learn? How did they learn it? Why?

What might the student teacher need to learn next? Why? How?

Personal philosophies of teaching PE

a. You said that teaching is...can you expand on this?

b. You said that an effective PE teacher is...what are the factors that affect teachers' work and effectiveness?

c. You said that an ineffective PE teacher is... Why do you believe that?

Student teacher response to cooperating teacher feedback

a. Describe how you felt during the lesson when the cooperating teacher was observing you?

b. In your view, what is the role of the cooperating teacher in developing your teaching skills?

c. How do you view the cooperating teacher's feedback?/Would you change how it is delivered?/ What might make it more constructive? (if applicable)

d. What have you learned from your cooperating teacher in the past number of weeks?

Appendix F: 3rd Interview Questionnaire

Research Question:

An analysis of learning in action: a joint analysis with cooperating teacher and student teacher about the ways in which learning is taking place as it happens and the different ways in which the parties engage in order to promote learning....

(a) To understand the nature of PETE student teacher learning?
(b) How do PETE student teachers learn how to teach?

Third Interview with Louise (CT) and Aoife (PETE student)
An Agenda

Interview 3
[Three parts – pre lesson, during lesson and post lesson]

The purpose of the third interview with the cooperating teacher and student teacher will be:

1. To build on previous data collection in Cycle One and Two to gain a deeper insight into the nature of PETE student teacher (ST) learning and how they learn to teach.
2. To explore how the ST has planned lessons for this Cycle, how she has been supported in doing this and what are her hopes and fears going into the class/has the focus changed from being organizational and discipline centred?/why or how has this changed?
3. To gain an understanding of how the PETE student teacher perceives her working relationship with her CT/are they on a par?/is there a perceived hierarchy?/ does she feel safe to express her opinions?/Has it changed from previous Cycle
4. To investigate how the ST feels and values about being observed and critiqued during lesson/how is criticism viewed?/Constructive or destructive?
5. To understand the student teacher's perception of the role of the CT in her development/ Is he/she a facilitator/dictator?
6. To investigate what the CT might hopes to see in the lessons in this Cycle and how he/she helped the ST to learn about these issues/ is the focus on management of learning environment or on the learner?
7. To observe the interaction between CT and ST in the post lesson phase, specifically looking at how the CT helps the student teacher to learn, identifies what, how and why she needs to learn following on from this lesson/ Is this constructive?/ How is it framed?/ What suggestions are made to improve practice/ Are there links to theory?
8. To understand how the teaching philosophy of the CT and the ST have evolved in the intervening period/ have they discussed their views?/Has anything changed in the intervening period?
9. To investigate the ST's perception of the Tutor's role in her development as a teacher/is it evaluative or facilitative?

10. To explore the CT's perception of the Tutor's role in TP? Does he/she feel on a par with the Tutor? Does she feel that they have a dual responsibility?

Key questions and prompts

Student Teacher

In your questionnaire you said:
"Someone we can touch base with, learn from and seek advice on how to improve our skills...Someone who sticks [sic] me as helpful even when I'm not necessarily asking for their help... more an assistant to help develop skills or ideas I may have had"

You said:
"I see myself as facilitator", helping student to open up to realise their potential...One interaction which springs to mind was how they described building up the town's profile and its attractiveness for others to settle there. I thought it summed up how I'm going to teach to keep them interested and wanting to attend."
Do you feel you have done this? Give examples? Who or what has helped you to do this?

You described your teacher shadow as:
Friendly, professional and also approachable would best describe her style... She is well liked and spoke highly in the staff room and as well amongst students
Would you still describe her in this manner? Why?

You said in week two that:
"Louise observed and she did give me good feedback"
Why was this feedback 'good' and is Louise still observing you and giving feedback?

Are you attached to both teachers now? Is Imelda still the best teacher, in your opinion? Why is she better?

You said that "*feedback is brief and you have to ask for it"* Is this still the case?

The feedback from the Imelda is better? Is this still the case?

You said that you were most concerned about *skill execution...remembering the teaching points*...Where do you get information to up-skill yourself? Where should you get this information?

You said that you have learned "*more about school ethos than about teaching in this school*" You said you have "*developed my own teaching, my own strategy, hours and hours of research into how to teach specific skills*"

I brought students to a badminton match and I haven't taught badminton so I don't know the rules. Are there any other examples of gaps in your knowledge and how are you counteracting this? Who is helping you?

You say you have more contact with Noelle...are the education tutors as accessible?

You said you would have "*preferred Louise not to be at the post lesson critique with Tutor because it was her first time seeing me teaching*"...How open are you to a CT being at the post lesson critique? You also said you need to get on with all parties if ST CT and Tutor had a say in assessment

You feel that you are *more linked with the College than with the school?*

My relationship and the feedback mightn't be as good as in other schools...although I have an ideal situation in that I don't dread coming here but at the same time I feel I don't get as much input from the school...Has this feeling changed? Why? How?

The college need to... make it more professional between the ST and the CT here give the school criteria to look at... We just became very pally and I'd say I'm just off to class and she'd sit in just for insurance purposes and she gives me slight feedback...I am basically developing the class on my own? When you say professional, how might this relationship be more professional? What are the drawbacks if the relationship is 'too friendly'? If any?

You said you felt isolated on the course...that Edel was the only person you could talk to...Has this changed?

You said that there was no one in the school to help her and that Imelda was *looking down her nose* at you? Is this still the case? Why do you feel she looks down on you?

I am doing everything to push myself on but there is only so much that I can do? I don't know how I can move myself on? We have no one to talk to, that we can trust? Has this changed?

You felt you had learned nothing since you got into the school? Or indeed in college because grades were summative with no qualitative comments?

You mentioned that *you had not been praised in any way on good teaching performances*? Has this changed?

Can you outline how you perceive the School Principals role on TP?

Cooperating Teacher

You said that Aoife had "*presence*". Can you elaborate on this? Is this still true? Why/Why not?

You had concerns about safety in classes...has this changed? Give examples? If it has changed who or what has instigated this change?

You mentioned that you were going to use a duplicate book to keep records of feedback? Has this happened?

"She is very good, she always contacts us and says what she is doing or what she plans to do".

Do you sit down with her and plan a lesson from the beginning?

You said one of the big difficulties is "*More often than not the problem is timing, trying to do ten classes in one*"

What do you do to try and help her change this?

You said that you thought that she was "*getting her ideas from a book...I see a lot of written stuff or theory for the girls and very little practical stuff, handouts were not at the right level for the girls...too advanced language-wise, knowledge-wise and to what they have done. It suits people who have played a lot of sport...she is not coming down to their level?*

Is this still the case? What evidence is there to support this?

You mentioned lack of content knowledge and that Imelda and yourself "*found it so hard to watch our classes being taught incorrectly*" You quoted the incident of the 'lay up being taught incorrectly'...Can you cite any other examples of this? If not, what do you think has changed?

"Her major difficulty is getting through the amount of theory that she has planned...She is very open to criticism but she is very confident...tries to get through her plan without interruption

Is this still happening? When you say interruption is that from the students or from you? Has there been an improvement? If so why?/why not?

What do you see your role as being in this process?

She is very lucky with the classes that she has...she can get through her plan...people are working away...She has no discipline problems now...when she has our other third years and first years who are wound up talking, she is going to have to teach, she is going to have to control?

Aoife probably has that mix of classes now, how is she managing them? How are you helping her to manage them?

I did point out to her about the basic knowledge ...she passed that off saying in the college, we are not doing every game, we are doing games for understanding...she said there was transfer from one game to another...

...You said that there was no transfer to swimming and that volleyball was a particular game... she passed it off

How did you feel when the tutor said this to you? How might it be tackled differently in college?

You said that the tutor "*did not show the critique to you after the lesson*" How can you be sure that your input has been included? Should it be included? Is this part of your role?

I'd never have that problem with content with a Greendale University student? Maybe with delivery of content but not with amount of content?

Do you still have the same feelings about this?

What is the primary role of the school principal in TP, in your opinion?

Research Question:

An analysis of learning in action: a joint analysis with cooperating teacher and student teacher about the ways in which learning is taking place as it happens and the different ways in which the parties engage in order to promote learning....

(a) To understand the nature of PETE student teacher learning?
(b) How do PETE student teachers learn how to teach?

Third Interview with John (CT) and Barbara (PETE student) – An Agenda

Interview 3
[Two parts – Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher]

The purpose of the third interview with the cooperating teacher and student teacher will be:

1. To build on previous data collection in Cycle One and Two to gain a deeper insight into the nature of PETE student teacher (ST) learning and how they learn to teach.
2. To explore how the ST has planned lessons for this Cycle, how she has been supported in doing this and what are her hopes and fears going into the class/has the focus changed from being organizational and discipline centred?/why or how has this changed?
3. To gain an understanding of how the PETE student teacher perceives her working relationship with her CT/are they on a par?/is there a perceived hierarchy?/ does she feel safe to express her opinions?/Has it changed from previous Cycle
4. To investigate how the ST feels and values about being observed and critiqued during lesson/how is criticism viewed?/Constructive or destructive?
5. To understand the student teacher's perception of the role of the CT in her development/ Is he/she a facilitator/dictator?
6. To investigate what the CT might hopes to see in the lessons in this Cycle and how he/she helped the ST to learn about these issues/ is the focus on management of learning environment or on the learner?
7. To observe the interaction between CT and ST in the post lesson phase, specifically looking at how the CT helps the student teacher to learn, identifies what, how and why she needs to learn following on from this lesson/ Is this constructive?/ How is it framed?/ What suggestions are made to improve practice/ Are there links to theory?
8. To understand how the teaching philosophy of the CT and the ST have evolved in the intervening period/ have they discussed their views?/Has anything changed in the intervening period?
9. To investigate the ST's perception of the Tutor's role in her development as a teacher/is it evaluative or facilitative?

10. To explore the CT's perception of the Tutor's role in TP? Does he/she feel on a par with the Tutor? Does she feel that they have a dual responsibility?

Key questions and prompts

Student Teacher

When you spoke about what you thought of mentors, you said:
I think mentors are good, they can help you learn new things and answer questions you may have. They are also good to bounce ideas off.
Has your opinion changed? Explain

You said that:
My dad has been my mentor. He has been involved with many sports and because I showed interest in the area he involved me in the teams.
Has John been a similar type of mentor? Explain your answer?

Your attitude to mentoring was:
Researcher: What way do you want to work this...do you want him to sit in on the class?
Barbara: Well I just want ideas...
Researcher: You don't want anyone there???
Barbara: Not that I son't want anyone there, but there is more pressure with everyone watching you...
Has this changed?

You said that your teaching metaphor was:
Being a good teacher was like making a patchwork quilt – it takes time, motivation and determination to achieve goal and it also involves incorporating different colours, materials and shapes to achieve your overall goal.
Has this view changed in any way?

Have your rules routines and expectations of the pupils changed since September?

You said before your very first lesson and your fourth lesson that you *" were afraid the kids wouldn't do it"* Is this what concerns you now at this stage?

After the first lesson you said:
Well, they were active anyway...They were passing around the ball...
Is this what you hope to achieve in lessons at this stage in the year?

You said that John had:
Researcher: Has he given you ideas?
Barbara: Yes.
Researcher: Is he usually in the class with ye? Does he usually look at it or...
Barbara: Em, sometimes.

Researcher: *at the end of class or anything so that ye can run through it but he hasn't actually seen it sometimes, it just depends on how busy he is.*

Is this still the level of contact with your mentor? Is Laura different? Do you find this interaction helpful?

On my second visit you couldn't name anything you had learned from John...Can you name any skills you have learned from him? What has been the barrier to this?

You also said you had learned a lot of skills from the university...from which lectures. Are all the lectures beneficial. How might the course be structured differently?

Have you met the school principal. Does he have a role in deciding your grade?
Are their any school policies in place to support student teachers in this school?

Cooperating Teacher

You said that you became a teacher because of:
Good role models (PE teachers and others)
Why were they "*good*"?
Do you consider yourself to be a good role model? Why?

You said that an effective PE teacher had to be:
Competent in subject matter and a wide range of techniques/strategies to teach.
Is Barbara all of these things? Please elaborate? What has helped/hindered her progress?

You described your duties as a mentor...

- *Equipment*
- *Feedback*
- *Safety*
- *Discipline*

Skills of a mentor

- *Communication skills*
- *Trouble shooting*

Would you amend any of these at this stage of TP?

You said that problems associated with mentoring included:
Difficulty being either in or out a lesson. Pupils pick up on pressure of co-op teacher. Also time for feedback.
Has this changed? Why?

You said that mentors could be rewarded by:

- *Training*
- *Thank you letter*

Have the university or school ever thanked you for your involvement? What level of commitment could you give to Mentor Training?

You were unhappy about the amount of content in each lesson?
Firstly the first thing, am...it was okay, I am fairly happy overall, just looking at your aims and objectives, maybe you went a bit ambitious, you tried to much thinking that this was going to be the dream class...I think on the objectives you had something like control, accuracy, dribbling as well?
Objectives – 35 min could concentrate on one
Has this changed? What/who has influenced this?

Is Barbara responding to your feedback...she didn't the last time?

The types of issues you focused on:

Cut down lesson plan
Think out drills
Many balls small space
Move to game quicker
More commanding
No talking
"popularity contest"
Demo clear
Tactics
Off leash
Give them space

Have these changed? What has Barbara learned/who has she learned from to change this?

What is the role of the Principal on TP? Has the school an active role in supporting student teachers. Are there any policies in place?

You said that in teacher training:
Again you are not taught them strategies...it's absolutely stupid...you see I play so many sports, I see ten different coaches every week ...I see them keeping kids away from each other
Confidence and competence then as well...noone ever had this conversation with me...it was only if I had a real big problem that I would go to a cooperating teacher to help me deal with this ...The things that I am saying now are not the kinds of things taught by a lecturer in there

Have these issues been addressed by the Greendale University course at this stage? How? If Barbara has learned them, is it from Greendale University or the school or elsewhere?

Regarding the structure of TP, you said:
There was nothing she could watch...I think Greendale University have their priorities a bit mixed up
How might you suggest it would run?

Research Question:

An analysis of learning in action: a joint analysis with cooperating teacher and student teacher about the ways in which learning is taking place as it happens and the different ways in which the parties engage in order to promote learning....

(a) To understand the nature of PETE student teacher learning?
(b) How do PETE student teachers learn how to teach?

Third Interview with Michael (CT) and Carol (PETE student)
An Agenda

Interview 3
[Two parts – Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher]

The purpose of the third interview with the cooperating teacher and student teacher will be:

1. To build on previous data collection in Cycle One and Two to gain a deeper insight into the nature of PETE student teacher (ST) learning and how they learn to teach.
2. To explore how the ST has planned lessons for this Cycle, how she has been supported in doing this and what are her hopes and fears going into the class/has the focus changed from being organizational and discipline centred?/why or how has this changed?
3. To gain an understanding of how the PETE student teacher perceives her working relationship with her CT/are they on a par?/is there a perceived hierarchy?/ does she feel safe to express her opinions?/Has it changed from previous Cycle
4. To investigate how the ST feels and values about being observed and critiqued during lesson/how is criticism viewed?/Constructive or destructive?
5. To understand the student teacher's perception of the role of the CT in her development/ Is he/she a facilitator/dictator?
6. To investigate what the CT might hopes to see in the lessons in this Cycle and how he/she helped the ST to learn about these issues/ is the focus on management of learning environment or on the learner?
7. To observe the interaction between CT and ST in the post lesson phase, specifically looking at how the CT helps the student teacher to learn, identifies what, how and why she needs to learn following on from this lesson/ Is this constructive?/ How is it framed?/ What suggestions are made to improve practice/ Are there links to theory?
8. To understand how the teaching philosophy of the CT and the ST have evolved in the intervening period/ have they discussed their views?/Has anything changed in the intervening period?
9. To investigate the ST's perception of the Tutor's role in her development as a teacher/is it evaluative or facilitative?

10. To explore the CT's perception of the Tutor's role in TP? Does he/she feel on a par with the Tutor? Does she feel that they have a dual responsibility?

Key questions and prompts

Student Teacher

You said that you: *Always had an interest in becoming a PE teacher, thought it was an easy job.* What is your view of PE teaching now?

What is your idea of a mentoring role, now? Has it changed?
It would be good to have a mentor in order to ask questions that you're unsure about.

Your view of teaching:
I am the farmer planting the seeds. This would refer to the teacher and her students.
What is your idea of teaching at this stage?

How should a mentor give feedback...has this changed? If so how?
He'd give me all stuff like this went wrong, that went wrong. I just took it all as negative but he was only trying to help me. He'd never actually say this is good but do this.

I just don't think he thinks I'm competent enough.
Does Michael think you are competent now?

I do my own lesson plans. He doesn't even see my lesson plans. He doesn't even know what I am actually putting into it. I don't think he thinks I have planned at all. He thought I just go in there...I do have lesson plans but they are not very detailed
Has Michael helped with lesson plans? Have your tutors seen these plans? Has your approach changed when planning since September, what/who has helped change it?

I think he thinks, he said to me he didn't really think this postgrad was working because I think, in general, Greendale University students feel they have a lot more knowledge than us. And they do... It kind of came out that he feels, which I kind of knew he felt that Brightwater students don't have enough background in the area whereas Greendale University students get six week blocks of badminton and they used to get assessed on badminton whereas we only have little bits here and there and we really are mainly an invasion as well. Which I think he is nearly right
Does Michael still say this...or do you feel that he still thinks it?

Kind of, do you want to go with Martha then, do you want to go with the other teacher.

Have you linked in with Martha more? Is she being helpful?

Do you still feel..
I think then maybe he looks down on us and I feel I have to prove myself every week to him more so than the students

Has this been addressed...
But the problem is Greendale University think we have all this stuff because we have done little courses on bits of things. We don't have proper i.e. athletics. I don't have a clue. I have to go look it all up myself.

but I said to him as well, do you think I am really unmotivated. I said to him and he just didn't answer and I said do you? And he said ya more or less. But I am. I was unmotivated.

Do you still agree with this? How are you receiving feedback now?
.... He probably was helping but what Nigel actually said was he thinks I can't take feedback. I take it all too critical. I don't think that's the case to be honest

Does he still sit in and give critiques, does he suggest improvements? Has anyone else observed you?
he is very good to watch. He takes in everything whereas some co-operating teachers might just go head off.

Do you want to be a PE teacher at this stage...Are you motivated? Why?why not
Yes, but I could go off and do more, you see that's the problem. This week I am really starting to go, come on, give it your all. I don't know whether I want to be a PE teacher. This is the problem.

How is you sleeping? Are you still nervous? If not why not?
Once I am in the school, I seem to be fine. But this morning, yes. I cant sleep at night. On a Sunday night... Oh, getting chest pains, anxiousness and before I come in. It probably is got to do with him as well. I am really trying to prove myself to him

Even last night, I felt a bit better than usual and I said why am I not as bad as usual. Cause I planned so much better. I had it down to a tee when I was going around the class. The class did run well.

I know that and do you talk to anyone in Greendale University about it? Is there anyone to talk to about this?
Carol: Oh yes, the girls.
Has this changed?

Are you positive now? Explain? Have you got the supports to help you be more positive?
I just think, I have been so negative about it and I just have to start being positive about it. I am moaning the last four months about it and I just have to

think to myself, I am in it now and give it your all. I am moaning too much. If you heard, every, do you know to someone.
Researcher: But there must be a reason.
Carol: Yes.
Researcher: You are not dreaming it. Its not that you are beating yourself up about something that you are not geared. There is a reason why you are feeling this way. You feel obviously unsupported, which is what you said to me.
Carol: yes.
Researcher: In every way you are not supported. It took you sitting down there crying for everything to come out.
Carol: Its so embarrassing.

Cooperating Teacher

You said you went into PE teaching because:
First time I thought about it was after doing summer camp work when 12/13. I enjoyed seeing people improve and have fun.

What is an effective PE teacher?
Someone who achieves.

Ineffective PE teacher?
Someone who just throws in ball all the time
Someone who produces 5 brilliant basket-ballers and 20 people who hate it.

Vision for Carol:
My only thing about teacher is like is that you have just got to get everyone to enjoy it like...if everyone enjoys it everyone participates. The first thing you have got to be able to do is to control the class...even the end of a ten week period, even with them she is able to walk in and get things going structure the class...I am not too worried about the quality at this stage, she's coming for a seven week block later on, classroom management comes first and everything else comes second cos you can't do anything without it...

Describe your relationahip with Carol?
How have you actively helped her to learn to teach?
What are the main barriers to this?
How might you be supported better to do this?

You said in your opinion *the key qualities and skills required to be a cooperating teacher/mentor?*

- *Communication*
- *Approachability*
- *Organisation*

Do you still believe this? Please elaborate on your answer?

You said that the current role of mentor was:

If they choose a student teacher, means classes off that's all. There is no defined 'role'. I would try to be someone who pointed them in the right direction.
What do you mean by the right direction?

What have learned from you mentoring role this year?

Research Question:

An analysis of learning in action: a joint analysis with cooperating teacher and student teacher about the ways in which learning is taking place as it happens and the different ways in which the parties engage in order to promote learning....

(a) To understand the nature of PETE student teacher learning?
(b) How do PETE student teachers learn how to teach?

Third Interview with Anita (CT) and Dara (PETE student) – An Agenda

Interview 3
[Two parts – Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher]

The purpose of the third interview with the cooperating teacher and student teacher will be:

1. To build on previous data collection in Cycle One and Two to gain a deeper insight into the nature of PETE student teacher (ST) learning and how they learn to teach.
2. To explore how the ST has planned lessons for this Cycle, how she has been supported in doing this and what are her hopes and fears going into the class/has the focus changed from being organizational and discipline centred?/why or how has this changed?
3. To gain an understanding of how the PETE student teacher perceives her working relationship with her CT/are they on a par?/is there a perceived hierarchy?/ does she feel safe to express her opinions?/Has it changed from previous Cycle
4. To investigate how the ST feels and values about being observed and critiqued during lesson/how is criticism viewed?/Constructive or destructive?
5. To understand the student teacher's perception of the role of the CT in her development/ Is he/she a facilitator/dictator?
6. To investigate what the CT might hopes to see in the lessons in this Cycle and how he/she helped the ST to learn about these issues/ is the focus on management of learning environment or on the learner?
7. To observe the interaction between CT and ST in the post lesson phase, specifically looking at how the CT helps the student teacher to learn, identifies what, how and why she needs to learn following on from this lesson/ Is this constructive?/ How is it framed?/ What suggestions are made to improve practice/ Are there links to theory?
8. To understand how the teaching philosophy of the CT and the ST have evolved in the intervening period/ have they discussed their views?/Has anything changed in the intervening period?
9. To investigate the ST's perception of the Tutor's role in her development as a teacher/is it evaluative or facilitative?

10. To explore the CT's perception of the Tutor's role in TP? Does he/she feel on a par with the Tutor? Does she feel that they have a dual responsibility?

Key questions and prompts

Student Teacher

When asked about mentoring you said:
It provides a support for people
How does a mentor do this? Is this your experience in this school?

You said that:
I can divide them into their ability and they are getting on grand
How do you teach to their ability and make sure that students are progressing?

You said that you worried that the pupils *would go off and do their own thing*?
What worries you most now before lessons? How do you meet that challenge?

You said that you chose shotputt initially...
Well they hadn't done it yet and I feel comfortable teaching it...
So that is the main reason...it's your comfort zone
What areas are you not so comfortable teaching? How do you upskill yourself?

What/who has been the most challenging thing on TP?

Do you still meet Anita before and after lessons? Where do you get your teaching ideas from?

When Anita gives you feedback, do you ever ask questions for clarification...

How do you find the post lesson reflections? Are they useful? Why? How?

Describe the structure of the Greendale University course? Has there been any overlap? How might it be designed better to fill any gaps in your training?

You said:
one of my main objectives is, and its not even in my lesson, for myself was that they were well behaved as a class. You know that you can actually have a class with them and try and get them to do things. That was the main thing in my head
Is this still your focus?

How did you find Liz's feedback the last day? She asked about J4 volleyball? Have you had a chance to research that? Did you find her helpful?

Have you had any interaction with the school principal? Is there any mechanism in place to support student teachers in this school?

Cooperating Teacher

You described an effective teacher as:
Good provider of opportunities to learn and enjoy
Is this still the case and has Dara shown these skills to date? How? Where and from whom has she learned them?

You said that the skills of the mentor were:
Sharing information and ideas, patient, enthusiastic.
Can you add to this? How might training in this role broaden your skill base? How available would you be to participate in such training?

At this point in TP do you feel you should have a role in TP assessment?

Has the Tutor looked for your feedback on student progress? Has this been included on the critique? Should it be included?

What criteria do you use to evaluate Dara's teaching?

What policies in the school support mentors and student teachers? How involved is the Principal in the process?

Have the university contacted you directly to ask for your involvement? Have they shown appreciation for the time and energy you have put into this? How might they do this?

You said that Dara was the *first Brightwater University student here and that she seemed better prepared than Greendale University students.* Do you still feel that this is the case? Why?

How did you find Liz's visit the last day?

You said that Dara had become really '*classroom aware*'? Can you outline what she has learned in addition to this in the past few months?

Research Question:

An analysis of learning in action: a joint analysis with cooperating teacher and student teacher about the ways in which learning is taking place as it happens and the different ways in which the parties engage in order to promote learning....

(a) To understand the nature of PETE student teacher learning?
(b) How do PETE student teachers learn how to teach?

Third Interview with Joan (CT) and Edel (PETE student) – An Agenda

Interview 3
[Two parts – Student Teacher and Cooperating Teacher]

The purpose of the third interview with the cooperating teacher and student teacher will be:

1. To build on previous data collection in Cycle One and Two to gain a deeper insight into the nature of PETE student teacher (ST) learning and how they learn to teach.
2. To explore how the ST has planned lessons for this Cycle, how she has been supported in doing this and what are her hopes and fears going into the class/has the focus changed from being organizational and discipline centred?/why or how has this changed?
3. To gain an understanding of how the PETE student teacher perceives her working relationship with her CT/are they on a par?/is there a perceived hierarchy?/ does she feel safe to express her opinions?/Has it changed from previous Cycle
4. To investigate how the ST feels and values about being observed and critiqued during lesson/how is criticism viewed?/Constructive or destructive?
5. To understand the student teacher's perception of the role of the CT in her development/ Is he/she a facilitator/dictator?
6. To investigate what the CT might hopes to see in the lessons in this Cycle and how he/she helped the ST to learn about these issues/ is the focus on management of learning environment or on the learner?
7. To observe the interaction between CT and ST in the post lesson phase, specifically looking at how the CT helps the student teacher to learn, identifies what, how and why she needs to learn following on from this lesson/ Is this constructive?/ How is it framed?/ What suggestions are made to improve practice/ Are there links to theory?
8. To understand how the teaching philosophy of the CT and the ST have evolved in the intervening period/ have they discussed their views?/Has anything changed in the intervening period?
9. To investigate the ST's perception of the Tutor's role in her development as a teacher/is it evaluative or facilitative?

10. To explore the CT's perception of the Tutor's role in TP? Does he/she feel on a par with the Tutor? Does she feel that they have a dual responsibility?

Key questions and prompts

Student Teacher

You said a mentor was:
Someone I can learn from, be guided towards the right path in teaching, see different approaches to teaching. Their method versus your own values/beliefs, a role model that can advise.
Do you still believe this?

You said an example of a mentor in your life was:
My lecturer in college in PE studies who was also my project (final year) supervisor. He was a great teacher in my eyes, gave good advice, got you thinking 'outside' the box when it comes to lesson plans. He guided/gave feedback and guided me into the direction of getting my abstract published. He knew that I could do these things, even though I doubted myself at times. Through doing a good project and getting an 'A' in it , along with my other subjects I got a First Class Honours degree, therefore an opening to apply for a Higher Diploma in Greendale University.
Would Joan be in this category? Why/why not? Give examples?

You said:
you had done most of the work preparing for the class by yourself?
Researcher: So, you haven't sat down and said hey Joan what do you think of this
Edel: I suppose the only time I would see them would be Monday and I get to talk to her in the staff room so…
Who has been responsible for your development on TP?

You said that
the ideas are coming from Greendale University
Is this still the case?

You also said:
I have for every week that I have done, I have my own personal reflections Basically, what were the weaknesses in the lesson. What do you think went wrong and what were the strengths. How would you deal with them in the next week. The strengths of the lesson – what went well and why they worked well. Why did things go wrong. So I'd find some would be very detailed and then towards the end they get lighter cos I was getting more ? Now the First Year one today will be long, I think. And as well looking at my cooperating teacher's advice on the sheets, it's getting another person's perspective and that really help
The gap seems to be pre lesson?

During our interactions you have spoken in a very detailed way about each lesson, how you have planned it, what might make it better...Have you ever spoken to Joan in this way?
How do you perceive my role? Is there room for a facilitator on the Grad Dip programme? Someone who is not involved in the assessment?
Like Sinead's lecture last week, I mean she is brilliant like but everything we were doing, like we had to write down all these things like a discipline problem in our school and how to deal with it and we had done this already with Ava. And then we are doing it again. It's grand but it's just repetition
Researcher: As you say, you have very little time...so much to get through
Have you any further examples of this? How can your time be used better to improve your learning?

Joan's feedback...
No that's great and your voice projection is much clearer as well, where as before you might have spoken and they weren't paying attention. Well today that wasn't an issue...they were all listening and you could tell they were all listening...I mean you did not speak until they were all listening you had them all 100%
What did you learn from that interaction?

How have you progressed in your teaching? What do you focus on in your lessons at this stage?

Cooperating Teacher

Teaching PE is very demanding and can become mundane over a period of time.
Why do you feel this way? What might change this feeling?

You mentoring metaphor was:
Big bear teaching little bear to fend for themselves throw exploring, observing, experimenting and evaluating – this will lead to baby bear learning a lot.
Is this metaphor the same, has it changed in the time you have worked with Edel? Have you done this with her?

You said that your mentoring duties were:

- *Looking at lesson plans*
- *Observing student teacher*
- *Evaluating lesson with the student teacher*

You have been using a specific guide...when do you see lesson plans, do you prepare them with Edel? When you say evaluating with the ST, what are the criteria used?

You said that Edel welcomed feedback...
Yes very much so. She is eager to find out how she can improve. She wants the feedback. She is not just happy to go away and do it. She loves the feedback.. She benefits from it as well. She has no problem with people

watching her or she has no problem asking questions.

You said that current assessment procedures were:

Not good. Tutors who visit a school 4 times over a period of 10 weeks cannot have a clear insight into the abilities of the student teacher.

Has your opinion changed during this experience?

Myself and Trevor were looking at her lesson planner and I was saying Edel I love working with you...I was saying where do get you all these ideas from. Because she has a soccer background I was thinking she did so much soccer. But she said no that some of it was in College and she looks books and the internet to find little games.

and

But I think now that she is all the time thinking not just like about discipline and making sure that they can hear her, which she has mastered. So now, its really, she want to get them to learn more and she is focusing more on are people learning

What has Edel learned since coming here? Outline the progression for her? Where has she learned it? How is she getting pupil's to learn more?

What level of content knowledge does she have? Are there any gaps?

You said that compensation could include a:

A thank you letter from the college or a small payment for tutorials with student teacher.

Would you be open to becoming involved in training at Greendale University towards a Masters??

Appendix G: Interview School Principal

Research Question:

An analysis of learning in action: a joint analysis with cooperating teacher and student teacher about the ways in which learning is taking place as it happens and the different ways in which the parties engage in order to promote learning....

(a) To understand the nature of PETE student teacher learning?
(b) How do PETE student teachers learn how to teach?

Interview with School Principals
An Agenda

Interview

The purpose of this interview with the School Principal will be:

1. To understand why Principal invites ST's to his/her school for TP? What are the benefits, if any, to the school? How long has the school been a site for TP?
2. To explore what he/she feels the role of the cooperating teacher (CT), the school and the university should be in the development of student teachers (ST).
3. To understand how the Principal supports ST development in the school? How might the relationship between Principal and ST be described? How often does he/she discuss progress with ST? Has he/she observed the ST teaching?/Can he /she give specific examples of how he/she supports the ST? Has he/she spoken with the CT about ST progress? Has he/she devised policy to support ST learning? Can he/she cite examples of such policy?
4. To investigate whether there a mechanism in place at the school for delivering feedback on ST progress on TP?/Does he/she feel that this is necessary? Why/Why not?
5. To examine whether Principals might change current Tutor and University practice in relation to the development of ST's. Is there a formal meeting with the university before TP/at end of TP? Has the university expectations of the school? Outline these?/Has the school expectations of the university? Outline these? Have these expectations been formalized?/Does the Principal meet with the Tutor on TP visits? What is the nature of that meeting? Does he/she have an input to ST final TP grade?
6. Does the school receive any remuneration for having ST's on TP?
7. To explore the Principal's view of an ideal TP scenario for ST? Outline support network for ST? What are the barriers to making this scenario a reality?

Key questions and prompts

Principal

- Why do you invite ST's to your school for TP? What are the benefits of this liaison? How long has the school been a site for TP?

- What do you feel should be the role of the cooperating teacher (CT), the school and the university in the development of student teachers (ST)?

- How do you support ST development in the school? Can you give specific examples? Have you discussed her progress? Have you school policies in place to support STs? Again, can you cite specific examples?

- How might the relationship between you and ST be described? How often do you discuss progress with ST?

- Is there a mechanism in place at the school for delivering feedback on ST progress on TP?/ If so, can you describe this mechanism? Do you feel that this is necessary? Why/Why not?

- Would you describe current Tutor and University practice in relation to the development of ST's? Is there a formal meeting with the university before TP/at end of TP? Has the university expectations of the school? What are they?/Has the school expectations of the university? What are they? Have these expectations been formalized?/Does the Principal meet with the Tutor on TP visits? What is the nature of that meeting? Do you have an input into final ST TP grade? Should you have an input into this grade?

- How and why might you change Tutor and University practice on TP?

- Does the school receive any remuneration for having ST's on TP? Should they?

- What is your view of an ideal TP scenario for ST? Can you outline how an ST might be supported in this scenario? Can this scenario be made a reality? If not, why not? What are the barriers?

Appendix H: PETE student Focus Group

Research Question:

An analysis of learning in action: a joint analysis with cooperating teacher and student teacher about the ways in which learning is taking place as it happens and the different ways in which the parties engage in order to promote learning...

(a) To understand the nature of PETE student teacher learning?
(b) How do PETE student teachers learn how to teach?

Focus Group Interview with all PETE students
An Agenda

Interview

The purpose of the focus group interview with the student teachers will be:

1. To build on previous data collection in Cycle One, Two and Three to gain a deeper insight into the nature of PETE student teacher (ST) learning and how they learn to teach.
2. To explore how the ST learning has been supported in TP by university, school and mentor during TP? Could this be more effective? If so, how?
3. To gain an understanding of how the PETE student teacher perceives her working relationship with her CT? Does CT view ST as a 'clone' (Blackburn et al, 1981) /are they on a par? /is there a perceived hierarchy? / Does she feel safe to express her opinions? / Does the CT listen to her at a 'deep level' (Snowber, 2005)? If ST were a mentor in the future, would she model herself on CT?
4. To examine the STs perceived aptitude of CT for the role of mentor? Where are they in career cycle (Huberman, 1980)? What are the attributes necessary to support ST learning?
5. To investigate how the ST applies theory to practice? Which Grad Dip. courses have been most valuable and why?
6. To explore the notion of mentors and mentees as 'co-learners in a process of discovery' (Patton, 2005)? Have both parties learned from the experience?
7. To examine how ST perceives the Brightwater University programme dovetails with the Grad Dip? Are they partners in the process of teacher education? Are there any gaps in the programme?
8. To investigate the value of cyclical TP process(Brouwer & Korthagen, 2005) for ST learning?
9. To gain an insight into how the assessment critique is received by STs? Could this process be improved? Should there be a role for CTs and School Principals in this?
10. To explore if the STs feel supported on a professional and personal level in the Grad Dip? Who would they confide in if experiencing problems? Why?
11. To gauge the level of ST satisfaction with the Grad Dip. To explore an alternative model for Grad Dip TP/blue sky thinking?

Key questions and prompts

Characteristics of a Teacher?

Can you outline the characteristics of a teacher and outline where these have been developed?

Has this list changed since the beginning of the course? Why? Please expand on your answer?

What student skills are required to gain the most from the Grad Dip programme? Do you feel supported academically, on a personal level, on this programme?

One Principal said that one of the key attributes of a teacher was '*self awareness*'. What did he mean by this statement, in your opinion? Do you feel that you have such '*self awareness*'?

Role of mentor

Was there a *'goodness of fit'* (Germain & Gitterman, 1987) between you and your mentor? Did you like and respect your mentor? Does mentoring relationship have to be a positive one? Can you recount any examples of negative exchanges? Were these worthwhile from a professional point of view?

What stage was your mentor at in their career cycle (Huberman, 1980)? What evidence do you have to support this? What do you feel is the optimum level to ensure excellence in mentoring?

Outline the role of mentor on a daily basis?

Can you identify any barriers to mentoring in the school?

Role of mentor in assessment? What criteria did your mentor use to give you feedback?

How might the mentor be better equipped to fulfill their role?

Can you outline three key mentoring qualities?

Did you feel that your mentor listened to you at a 'deep level' (Snowber, 2005)? Cite examples of this?

Would you see yourself as a mentor in the future? How might you fulfill this role?

Would you agree with notion that mentors are more inclined to invest in proteges that most resemble themselves? (Blackburn et al, 1981)? Give reasons for your answer?

It has been said that mentors and mentees are *"co-learners engaged in a process of discovery"*(Patton, 2005)? Would you agree or disagree with this view? Can you give instances of this?

At this point in the year, do you feel equipped to take up a full time teaching position? Please expand on your answer? What skills have you acquired during this year? What aspects of the programme have prepared you, specifically?

Blue Sky Thinking: How might the Mentoring Process be improved in schools? Give the profile of an ideal mentor?

Course structure

How might the Brightwater University course prepare students better for the Grad Dip? Give specific examples? Practical subjects? Arts subject?

Can the course be better structured to meet your needs and prepare you for teaching? If so, how? Are there any gaps in your preparation? What aspects of the programme were most beneficial and why?

How have you used the theory learned on your courses on TP? How relevant has it been to your teaching? Cite examples, please?

List three key skills learned during TP, where and from whom did you learn them?

Blue Sky Thinking: What is the ideal structure for this course? What components must it have to prepare you as a teacher?

Teaching Practice Structure

Greendale University has used a cyclical approach to TP (Brouwer & Korthagen, 2004). How has this impacted on your progress as a teacher?

How did you find being on your own on TP? Would it have been beneficial to have had another student teacher there? Can you see any advantages/drawbacks to this arrangement?

Blue Sky Thinking: What, in your opinion, is the ideal structure of TP? What is the most valuable structure to prepare you best for your teaching role?

Role of Tutors

How did Tutors support learning? Give examples to support your answer?

Would you tell your tutors if you were experiencing problems on TP? Explain your answer?

What is the ideal profile of a Tutor to support <u>your</u> learning, in terms of experience etc...

Describe how feedback was delivered? Could this be improved? How? Have you analysed the Critique form? Would you make any changes to this? How might assessment be structured? Ideally who should assess you on TP?

<u>Blue Sky Thinking</u>: In an ideal scenario, what should the role of the Tutor be on TP? How might the tutor best support you during TP?

Support of School

Can you outline tangible evidence of support from school? Details of Induction Programme, if any?

Should the School Principal have an input into your TP assessment? Give reasons for your answer?

<u>Blue Sky Thinking</u>: How might the school support you on TP...what is your ideal scenario?

Blue Sky Thinking

So, in summary, if you had the power to redesign TP on the Grad Dip programme what would you do to change it?
In your answer, try to address

- The role of CT, Tutor, School on TP
- Length of time in schools
- School Support
- Assessment – format and by whom?
- Grad Dip courses – type and content
- Preparation of students in Brightwater University for this course?

Can you consider where you are now, given that this course can't cover everything but is only a starting point...How might you be supported in your first year of teaching? What part might Greendale University play in this?

How would you like to see this research develop? Where to now?

Appendix I: Tutor Focus Group

Research Question:

An analysis of learning in action: a joint analysis with mentor and mentee about the ways in which learning is taking place, as it happens, and the different ways in which the parties engage in order to promote learning....

(a) To understand the nature of PETE student teacher learning?
(b) How do PETE student teachers learn how to teach?

Interview with Tutors – An Agenda

Interview 1

The purpose of this interview with the Tutors will be:

1. To understand how the Tutor(s) view their role in Teaching Practice (TP)? /Do they enjoy it? / What are the negative aspects of it? / Did they receive training to carry out this role?
2. To investigate the qualities that Tutor's believe indicate an excellent teaching performance (a) one week in (b) end of first block (c) end of second block from a personal point of view i.e. beyond the grid.
3. To ascertain whether the Tutors can gauge the hopes and fears of Student Teachers (ST) in relation to TP. Do they really get to know students on a personal level?
4. To investigate the range of criteria used by Tutor when assessing the ST? /Are some more important than others?
5. To discover whether the Tutor has an understanding of and a value on ST prior knowledge i.e. knowledge gained before embarking on this Graduate Diploma (Grad Dip)? / Have they spoken to the Cooperating Teacher (CT) on this issue? Ethically, can this be done?
6. To explore the ways in which the Tutor has supported the ST learning during teaching practice to date.
7. To understand how the Tutor delivers his/her post lesson critique to the student teacher? Why is it delivered in this way? /Is the CT present?
8. To understand whether the Tutor and the CT have a shared philosophy of teaching and whether they have articulated this in their recent conversations?
9. To explore the relationship between the Tutor and the CT? / To ascertain how the CT's role is perceived by the Tutor/ Are they viewed as partners in supervision or is there a dichotomy in their roles.
10. To explore how Tutors are experiencing the process of supervising these students. How does it differ from supervisions of students on other degree programmes? If so, why? / Have they discussed this matter with CTs.
11. To identify the areas of the Grad Dip Curriculum which have been most beneficial to the ST when learning to teach on TP?
12. To understand how TP schools are selected and monitored? /To examine the role of the school principal during TP?

Key questions and prompts

General

- Do you feel you are qualified to support student learning during TP? What is it that makes you qualified to do this?
- Did you receive any training to carry out this function?
- What are the most rewarding aspects of your role? / What are the most frustrating sides of this job?
- Why do you think you are an effective tutor? / What qualities do you bring to the role?
- In your opinion, what are the qualities that indicate an excellent teaching performance (a) week in (b) end of first block (c) end of second block from a personal point of view i.e. beyond the grid? Can you rank these?

Tutor-Student Teacher Relationship

Knowledge of ST

Have you had an opportunity to gauge nature and source of ST prior knowledge of subject area?

ST progress

Can you comment on progress of your ST in relation to learning to teach? / What/who has contributed to their progress?

Pre TP

What role do you play in preparing the ST for TP?

During TP

What is the primary role of the Tutor during TP?/What are the additional roles of the Tutor during TP?

Pre lesson

Can you outline the nature and function of meetings with STs prior to lessons?

During lesson

What criteria are you assessing during the lesson? Which, for you, are the most valuable in teaching?

Post lesson feedback

- In your experience what have you found to be the most effective way to critique a lesson and deliver feedback?
- How do you introduce the critique? Focus on positive or negative aspects?
- What are the key observations?
- What language is used?
- How does the ST respond? / Are they invited to respond?

Pastoral

- To ascertain whether the Tutors can gauge the hopes and fears of Student Teachers (ST) in relation to TP. Do they really get to know students on a personal level.

General

- Should the ST have a role in their own assessment?/How might they be prepared for such a role?

Tutor-Cooperating Teacher Relationship

- Have you had an opportunity to meet with the CT?/ Can you outline the nature of the discussion that took place?/ Did you talk about the level of ST subject content knowledge? Please elaborate on this.../Is it ethically sound to do this?
- Have you discussed your philosophy of good quality teaching with each other? If not, why not?
- Do you invite the CT to be present at the post lesson feedback?
- How did CT respond to your observations?/ What was the mood of the meeting?
- What is/should be the function of the CT in TP? /Should they have any role in assessment? /How might they be prepared for such a role? /How might they be selected for such a role?

Tutor-TP School Relationship

- Currently, what selection criteria are employed in the selection of TP schools?
- Are these schools subjected to any evaluation before an ST is placed there on TP?
- Can you describe the nature of any liaison with school personnel prior to/during TP visit?
- What is the nature and function of the role of School Principal in TP?

Graduate Diploma Course Content

Have you any comments regarding course content in terms of how it supports the ST? Have you any ideas on how it might be improved for the next academic year?, It might be too early to say?

Appendix J: Grounded Theory

Level One Open Coding
Aoife: Mentor- Mentee Relationship

Mentor-Mentee Relationship

Cloning Mentor- Mentee [Goodness of fit/respect]

Cycle One Questionnaire Aoife	
Friendly, professional and also approachable would best describe her style.	Is this the type of teacher that Aoife wants to emulate?
How does he/she view the role of the teacher? To help and facilitate student to be successful and improve on what their level of ability is…	Again, is this the type of teaching to which Aoife aspires?
How does he/she interact with the students? As a group to explain tasks out more often, to note its done one to one as they work, giving them all time and feedback on work. **What aspects of teaching do they find most enjoyable?** Seeing them improve, progress in skills..	The language used may point to the fact that Aoife is in awe of this teacher and really wants to emulate her…
How does your teaching metaphor compare to this teacher's metaphor? Hers is based on bringing the best out in students, help one to one. Help to bring out their potential in their work.	Does she answer the question? Seems to be very like her own view which is that of facilitator. Is it also true that the ST will work best with a clone of themselves i.e. a teacher to whom they aspire.
Cycle One Questionnaire Louise	
• Very organised • Calm • Collected • Identified weakness using good student to demo ?	Interesting choice of words to describe Aoife. Does she think that she shouldn't be calm given that she has little knowledge of the area? Acknowledges that Aoife realizes that perhaps volleyball is not her strong point and uses student demo…
Safety Priority	She is very disparaging of Aoife to

Organisation Balls rolling over the floor. It's the teaching fear if they don't do this, this year they may revert to coaching. (Links to "washout").	me and yet behaves in the opposite way when Aoife is in front of her. Is this a personality issue? Is she a people pleaser? Afraid to give criticism?
a) What is the body language of both parties? Louise open/Aoife open	Positive belying the negative comments to me They are still trying to figure each other out? There may be some hope for the relationship at this point
Cycle Two Phase 1 Aoife	
Does Louise help you set up...or what kind of help does Louise give you... last week Louise observed and she did give me good feedback...the first week I just had a sub teacher in with me...so this week should be somewhat better. Things went a bit jeery last week so Louise helped me split up the group a small bit. I do like the idea of her coming in at any stage if she wishes...she tends to sit out and observe...	She seems hopeful that Louise will be available to her if things go awry?

Level Three Developing the Themes: Colour Codes

Greendale University - Brightwater University Relationship

Brightwater University Inferior to Greendale University
Self fulfilling prophecy

Grad Dip Course Content

Prior Knowledge [Brightwater University dovetail with Greendale University]
Course content
Perceived Relevance of content to ST (Theory Practice debate)
Course design – TP etc

Mentor Mentee Relationship

Cloning Mentor- Mentee [Goodness of fit/respect]
Mentor caring about mentee
Power: Mentee controlling Mentor input [power struggle, who is in charge]
Career cycle of Mentor
Expertise of Mentor [Feedback quality of mentor]
Mentor and mentee victims of the system of supervision
Personality of mentor: person vs mentor
Willingness of the CT to train as a mentor
Emulating own experience of CT support

Greendale University School RelationshipGreendale University Community Relationship

School Support of Mentee

ST and Principal relationship
Benefits to the school
School role on TP
Relationship with university[grey and dark green]
View of good practice
Feedback/communication in school re ST progress
Power: not having a choice in ST but being able to voice opinion on calibre of ST[teal and violet]
Motivation for having STs in school [turquoise and green]
Support and Training for CTs for the role[olive green and pink highlight]
Support and Training for the CT [dark blue and green highlight]
Collusion on grade
Respecting and liking the ST [brown and dark yellow]
Protecting Pupils Pupils rights [violet and turquoise highlight]
Employability of the ST
Principal Tutor relationship [indigo and dark yellow]
Views on CT as assessor? [dark teal and yellow]
Own experience as Mentee [green and light grey highlight]

Student Learning

Self Awareness

ST welfare [Facilitator to counsel ST]
Communication skills
Career guidance
What is learned
Self protection

Tutor - ST relationship

Respect
Power
Feedback/Expertise
Liking tutor

Student Teacher - Peer Relationships

Support
Competition
Feedback

Tutor - CT Relationship

Cloning
Collusion on Grading
Joint expectation of ST

University and CT role in preparation of ST

Joint responsibility

Assessment Grading

By Tutor
Consultation with CT
Consultation with Principal

ST- Pupil Relationship

Pupil learning
Being on a level/relating to pupils
Caring about pupils
Pupils respecting ST
Pupil liking ST
Motivating Pupils to learn
Student Teacher respecting pupil

Facilitator to Counsel ST

Perception of PE

Fun Vs Learning

ST as future Mentor

Code Families

HU: 2007 08 07 - PhD analysis (loaded - with coding)
File: [Z:\Documents_WIP\PhD 2007\Draft Data Analysis 0...\2007 08 07 - PhD analysis (loaded - with coding).hpr5]
Edited by: Super
Date/Time: 08/31/07 05:23:42 PM

Code Family: Assessment and Grading
Created: 08/07/07 08:52:20 PM (Super)
Codes (6): [Collusion by school and GU on grade] [School role in TP] [Tutor-CT collusion on grade] [Tutor-CT joint expectation of ST] [GU-CT joint responsibility for ITT] [GU school relationship]
Quotation(s): 140

Code Family: Grad Dip Course Content
Created: 08/07/07 08:34:00 PM (Super)
Codes (5): [Employability of ST] [Perceived relevance of content to ST:They are all in fairyland] [Post Grad Dip support] [Prior Knowledge from IT Brightwater] [GU course design]
Quotation(s): 186

Code Family: Mentor-Mentee Relationship
Created: 08/07/07 08:35:15 PM (Super)
Codes (22): [bent over backwards] [Career Cycle of Mentor] [Cloning: goodness of fit/respect] [Duty of care to ST] [Effects of Stress on ST] [Expertise/Feedback of mentor] [How the ST learns?] [Just take off on my own] [Mentor caring about mentee] [Mentor emulating own experience of CT support] [Mentor/Mentee victims of system of supervision] [Personality of mentor: person versus mentor] [Power: Who is in charge - Mentor or Mentee] [ST Accepting Feedback] [ST resilience] [ST self-protection] [ST trusting CT] [STs say CTs need training] [View of CT role] [What is learned by ST] [Where ST learns?] [Willingness of CT to train as mentor]
Quotation(s): 418

Code Family: Perception of PE
Created: 08/07/07 08:57:13 PM (Super)
Codes (1): [Perception of PE: Fun or Active is learning]
Quotation(s): 32

Code Family: School Support of Mentee
Created: 08/07/07 08:38:24 PM (Super)

Codes (25): [Benefit to CT] [Benefits of TP to school] [bent over backwards] [Collusion by school and GU on grade] [Duty of care to ST] [Effects of Stress on ST] [Employability of ST] [Feedback in school re ST progress] [Just take off on my own] [Mentor/Mentee victims of system of supervision] [Motivation for having STs in school] [Power of the parent] [Power: no choice in ST] [Principal's own experience as Mentee] [Principal-Tutor relationship] [Principal caring for staff] [Principal protecting pupils' rights] [Principal respecting and liking ST] [School role in TP] [ST and Principal relationship] [Support and Training for CTs] [Support and training for CTs for mentoring role] [GU school relationship] [View of good (teaching) practice] [Views on CT as assessor of TP]
Quotation(s): 276

Code Family: ST - Pupil Relationship
Created: 08/07/07 08:55:02 PM (Super)
Codes (9): [Principal protecting pupils' rights] [Pupils respecting ST] [ST-Pupils liking each other] [ST caring about pupils] [ST focus on Pupil learning] [ST motivating pupils to learn] [ST relating to pupils] [ST respecting pupils] [ST social skills]
Quotation(s): 67

Code Family: ST learning
Created: 08/07/07 08:44:01 PM (Super)
Codes (23): [Career guidance] [Effects of Stress on ST] [Expertise/Feedback of mentor] [How the ST learns?] [Inclusion of ST in school life] [Just take off on my own] [Mentor/Mentee victims of system of supervision] [Perceived relevance of content to ST:They are all in fairyland] [Perception of PE: Fun or Active is learning] [Post Grad Dip support] [reality of teaching] [Reflective practice] [Researcher as Counsellor] [ST as future mentor] [ST communication skills] [ST focus on Pupil learning] [ST motivating pupils to learn] [ST resilience] [ST self-protection] [ST self awareness] [ST social skills] [What is learned by ST] [Where ST learns?]
Quotation(s): 476

Code Family: ST Peer Relationships
Created: 08/07/07 08:47:53 PM (Super)
Codes (4): [Effects of Stress on ST] [ST competition] [ST peer feedback] [ST Support from peers]
Quotation(s): 33

Code Family: Tutor- ST Relationship
Created: 08/07/07 08:46:31 PM (Super)
Codes (5): [Perceived relevance of content to ST:They are all in fairyland] [ST liking tutor] [Tutor-ST Power] [Tutor-ST respect] [Tutor

feedback/expertise]
Quotation(s): 147

Code Family: Tutor - CT Relationship
Created: 08/07/07 08:49:47 PM (Super)
Codes (9): [IT Brightwater Inferior to GU] [Tutor-CT cloning (goodness of fit)] [Tutor-CT collusion on grade] [Tutor-CT joint expectation of ST] [GU-CT joint responsibility for ITT] [GU school relationship] [View of CT role] [View of good (teaching) practice] [Views on CT as assessor of TP]
Quotation(s): 173

Code Family: GU-school relationship
Created: 08/12/07 08:13:29 PM (Super)
Codes (7): [Collusion by school and GU on grade] [Employability of ST] [Feedback by Principal to GU on ST progress] [School role in TP] [GU-CT joint responsibility for ITT] [View of good (teaching) practice] [Views on CT as assessor of TP]
Quotation(s): 102

Code Family: GU - IT Brightwater Relationship
Created: 08/07/07 08:33:13 PM (Super)
Codes (2): [IT Brightwater Inferior to GU] [Self fulfilling prophecy]
Quotation(s): 17

Appendix K: Interim Report for Greendale University

Interim Report

Working Title
Supporting PETE student teachers to learn-in-action: Teaching practice supervision within a communities-of-practice framework

Overview
Working collaboratively with Greendale University tutors and the Professor of the Physical Education and Sports Science (PESS) department, the PhD examines physical education teacher education (PETE) student learning during teaching practice (TP). The timing of the research coincided with the introduction of a Graduate Diploma in Education (Physical Education) [Grad Dip] programme at Greendale University. It is envisaged that the research outcomes will be of interest to the key participants: student teachers, cooperating teachers and Greendale University tutors, school principals

In essence, the study had two key aims: Firstly, to understand how PETE student learning is supported during TP. Secondly, to establish the nature of student learning that takes place.

Research Questions
Primary questions

1. *How are PETE students supported to learn effectively during TP within the current model of supervision?*
2. *What is the nature of the PETE student learning that takes place?*
3. *How do teacher-mentors and university tutors view their roles and the nature of learning within current model of supervision?*
4. *How does school-based learning link to other strands of the teacher education programme in supporting student teacher competence?*

Sub-questions

- *What does international research literature say about learning, teacher learning and student teacher learning?*
- *From international research literature, what is known about different models of learning and on what theories of learning are they based? How is mentoring framed within these theories of learning?*
- *Which learning theories underpin ITE supervision models, internationally?*
- *What are the theoretical underpinnings of the current model of supervision at Greendale University?*
- *What are the roles of PETE student, mentor and university tutor in the current model?*
- *What are the implications of a new model of TP supervision for PETE students, tutors and cooperating teachers?*
- *What might a new model of TP supervision look like? On what theory of learning might it based?*

Rationale
This study critically analysed teaching practice (TP), and specifically TP supervision, as a productive learning context for PETE students within ITE.

"*Teacher education remains a black box. We do not know what effective teachers do, know, believe or build on nor do we know what conditions make it possible*" (Cochran-Smith, 2005:8). Taken against the backdrop of the current intense scrutiny of evidence-based teacher education research "*where there is an intentional and systematic effort to unlock the black box of teacher education, turn the lights on inside it an shine spotlights into its corners, rafters and floorboards*" (Cochran-Smith, 2005:8), the focus here is upon the range of factors that impinge on what is learned and how learning takes place within TP.

According to Barab and Duffy (2000:26), there has been a shift in the use of learning theories within education from cognitive theories that emphasise individual learners, to anthropological or situative theories that focus on the social nature of learning. In situative theories, learning is associated with an increase in the ability to participate effectively in the practices of a community; thus learning is conceptualised as collaborative social practice, located in communities of practice (CoP) and occurs through legitimate peripheral participation (LPP) in those communities (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Linking the notion of LPP to ITT, Lave and Wenger (1991) argue that *'To be able to participate in a legitimately peripheral way entails that newcomers have broad access to arenas of mature practice'* (p. 110). Taking this perspective on learning has obvious implications for the ways in which TP supervision is understood and constructed, specifically in relation to the role of mentors in moving apprentice teachers (newcomers) from LPP to full participation in the CoP (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

A CoP is a persistent, sustained social network of individuals who share '*social capital*' (Putnam, 2000): knowledge base, set of beliefs, values, history and experiences focused on a common practice and/or mutual enterprise (Barab et al, 2002). Applied to the school environment, this concept has implications for the ways in which we train teachers. It could be argued that new teachers should be able to undertake teaching practice within supportive CoPs comprising colleagues, mentors, student peers and university tutors. Moreover, such a community should facilitate learning through ongoing discussion, sharing, and collaboration on commonly valued issues and concerns (Mawer, 1996). In this way, teacher competencies can be developed in authentic conditions (Fenwick, 1999) and we may make sense of "*the school conditions that make it possible for new teachers to take advantage of the resources available to them* (Cochran-Smith, 2005:9)

Research Process

1. Presentation of Research Proposal to Greendale University tutors from PESS department and Educational and Professional Studies (EPS) department.

2. To understand how PETE student learning is supported during TP and to establish the nature of learning that takes place.

(a) The Grad Dip Programme was initiated with an Intensive Induction Week for all PETE students. During this week the PETE students attended workshops and lectures to prepare them for the TP experience. The researcher attended two days of this Induction week to chronicle student prior learning.

(b) Within the Grad Dip Programme, TP is viewed as a cyclical process as advocated by Brouwer & Korthagen (2005). There are *three* cycles: 3 observation weeks in schools, one-day-per-week TP and 7 week blocked TP. In order to capture how PETE student learning is supported, data were captured from 5 cases, during each cycle from PETE students and their cooperating teachers. In addition, data were gathered from Greendale University tutors from associated school principals and from the researcher herself.

(c) Greendale University tutors associated with the Grad Dip Programme have one meeting per semester to train tutors who lack experience in supervising PETE students. The researcher has attended the first meeting.

Methodology:

Methods

The study analysed <u>one</u> umbrella case in Ireland (a university, PETE students, five schools) which comprised five individual cases (five tetrads of University Tutor, PETE Student Teacher, CT and School Principal).

The Cases

Setting:

There are *five* individual case studies. Pseudonyms have been used throughout .

Case Study Number	Student Teacher	Cooperating Teacher	University Tutors	School Principal	School type
1	Aoife	Louise	Noelle	Mr. Kelly	Girls - town
2	Barbara	John	Claire	Mr. Cotter	Girls - town
3	Carol	Michael	Claire	Mr. O'Brien	Mixed - rural
4	Dara	Anita	Liz	Mr. Clancy	Mixed-town
5	Edel	Joan	Claire	Mr. Noonan	Mixed rural

The research was undertaken using a range of qualitative research methods (questionnaires, interviews and focus group interviews and reflective journals) and a systematic grounded theory approach to data analysis.

The specific approaches used within the case study framework included:

(A) Open Profile Questionnaires to elicit life histories of participants within each case study.
Two open profile questionnaires were used in this study. One was distributed to the five student teachers during the 'Observation Week' Cycle of TP. The second was issued to all participating cooperating teachers during the same phase. Before each questionnaire was issued a comprehensive rationale was done to ensure that the questions asked were led by the research questions.

(B) Recording key events to frame the progress of the Graduate Diploma in Education (Physical Education).
The author attended two days of the Induction week for students in August. She acted as a scribe, recording all the significant occurrences (focus) and the lectures/workshops in which PETE student teachers participated. This also helped to provide information on life histories of PETE student teachers. In addition the author was invited to attend a Grad Dip Tutor meeting in September. This meeting provided data on planning for the supervision of cyclical TP and also served as a training session for those tutors who had not supervised a PETE student on TP.

(C) Focus Groups
Marshall and Rossman (1999) trace this method of interviewing participants in focus groups to marketing research. There are a number of references to focus groups in the literature. Morgan (1997) says that focus groups are unique in that they can produce a range of data and insights that are more accessible with interaction in a group setting.
The main advantage with using focus groups lies in the fact that they are *"socially oriented"* (Marshall & Rossman, 1999:115). This means that participants may feel relaxed in this more conversational and supportive environment. One focus group comprised PETE students and the other Greendale University tutors. Due to geographical constraints, it was not possible to conduct a focus group interview with the cooperating teachers or school principals.

The researcher when using the focus group approach can generate rich data through active listening (Oliver & Lalik, 2000), where the interviewer clarifies ambiguous responses using a very specific method of interviewing called 'hierarchial focusing' (Tomlinson, 1989 in Hobson, 2003:248). This type of interview gains in-depth accounts to ensure coverage of the researcher's agenda (asking leading questions perhaps generated from prior interviews or classroom observations) yet also allowing interviewees to raise new issues.

There are a number of criticisms or limitations of the focus group approach. Brown & Gilligan (1992) say that some participants may be more vocal than others. Therefore it is important for the researcher to listen to 'what is not said'

to evaluate the silences and to encourage an atmosphere of trust where pupils feel they can speak in confidence (Oliver & Lalik, 2000). As Constantine (1999 cited in Clark, 2001:33) says about translating poetry, one must consider" *the total workings of a text, not just the words".* Also finding an appropriate setting for the focus group interviews can be difficult. Finally, there may be temporal (Strauss and Corbin, 1998) limitations to the study. Strauss & Corbin (1998) refer to these considerations when they say:

> *There are always constraints of time, energy, availability of participants, and other conditions that affect data collection...sometimes the researcher has no choice and must settle for a theoretical scheme that is less developed that desired* (pp.292/3).

In spite of these shortcomings, focus groups were appropriate for this research because they offered a natural social setting that could encourage discussion.

(D) **Collection of artefacts** to elicit the students' understanding of the teaching and learning process at the outset of the Grad Dip Programme.

Examples of data collected included: PETE student assignments on 'Teaching Metaphor' (to capture students' views on the role of the teacher); Student Knowledge Questions' (to understand the types of knowledge that a student teacher thinks she might need); Student Shadow' (shadowing two students in the TP school during observation weeks to understand how they experience school); 'Teacher Shadow' (shadowing a teacher who is perceived to be an excellent practitioner); 'Community Mapping' (charting the facilities available in the community that support PE) and 'Rules, Routines and Expectations' (strategies for use the classroom)

(E) In-depth interviews:
These were conducted during each phase of the cyclical teaching practice model (Brouwer & Korthagen, 2005). University Course Co-ordinator, PETE students and co-operating teachers, university tutors and school principals were interviewed to understand how the PETE student teacher learning was supported during the teaching practice experience. In addition, in order to understand the mentoring climate in ROI, an interview was conducted with a senior member of one of the second level teachers' unions.

(F) Reflective journal Writing
Cooper, (1991) argues that journal writing can serve as a form of *self-reflection and self-analysis* (cited in Oliver & Lalik, 2000:112). Furthermore, writing, as a reflective practitioner/student/person is " *A method of inquiry that provides a research practice through which we can investigate how we construct the world ourselves and others* (Richardson, 2000:924). The author maintained a reflective journal throughout the study to capture her views at every stage of data collection.

Following the work of Rossman & Rallis, (1998 cited in Azzarito & Ennis, 2003) this study has employed a *member check* to verify the views of all

participants. While acknowledging the limitations of this process, a member check has been used to:

> *Enhance the validity of the researcher's interpretation of the data collection by discussing and comparing the findings of the first data analysis with the participants' perspectives to clarify and add information to the data analysis*
> (Rossman & Rallis, 1998 cited in Azzarito & Ennis, 2003:184/185)

Research Method Time Line

Stage One: Interview with Senior Member of Teachers' Union, on the views of the union on mentoring during TP in schools.

Stage Two: Presentation to Greendale University tutors on Research Proposal

22nd June, 2006
Two hour PowerPoint presentation to members of PESS and EPS department.

July and August 2006
Finalised all participant letters and contracts.

Stage Three: Support for PETE student learning – Induction Week

21st -25th August, 2006
(a) Attended two days of Grad Dip induction week programme (day one and day five)
(b) Presentation to all 17 PETE students outlining the study and requested five volunteers to participate in the study
(c) Forwarded letters to ask cooperating teachers, Greendale University tutors and school principals to participate in study.

Stage Four: Data Collection Cycle One

September 2006
During Observation weeks open profile questionnaires were distributed to PETE students and to cooperating teachers

Stage Five: Data collection Cycle Two (Phase one and Phase two)

September – December 2006

(a) During 'one-day-per-week TP, data were collected twice in the form of in-depth interview questionnaires from PETE students and cooperating teachers. Interviews were also conducted with Greendale University tutors.
(b) Collection of artefacts from PETE students (Teaching Metaphor, Student Knowledge Questions, Teacher Shadow, Student Shadow, Community Mapping, Rules Routine and Expectations)

Stage Six: Data collection Cycle Three (Phase one and Phase Two)
January to March 2007

During the 'seven week block' TP, data were collected twice from PETE students during an in-depth interview questionnaire and also a focus group interview. Data were collected once from cooperating teachers using in-depth interview questionnaires. In addition, data were collected from Greendale University tutors once through a focus group interview. Finally data were collected once from each of the five school principals through an in-depth interview questionnaire.

Stage Seven: Presentation to PESS and EPS tutors on preliminary findings
September 2007

The wide range of data were analysed using a computer analysis tool, ATLAS.ti, for analyzing qualitative data. This tool allowed data to be analysed using a systematic approach to grounded theory. In the doctoral thesis, it is intended to present each of the participants (PETE Students, CTs Greendale University Tutors and Principals) within each of the five case studys as a separate vignette. In addition, themes which appear common to all case studies will be presented in individual chapters.

In this presentation, the researcher presents some of the preliminary dominant themes identified in the data through the grounded theory process.

Preliminary Findings

PETE Students Experience of TP

Self Confidence in Teaching Ability:
In pre-course interviews, two out of five of the PETE students had little confidence in their readiness for teaching when they started the course. They spoke of the Interview Selection Process and of needing feedback on why they were successful at interview for Grad Dip programme. There appeared to be a lack of confidence in their teaching ability, which may stem from:

The perception that Greendale University students are condescending because they have come to the university through a different route:

> *It's like we are so great...we got in here...wow, yes, you got 500 points, do you want a medal like you know* (Carol, Focus Group Interview, March 2007).

> *Yes. You are only doing a one year course. Where did you come from...Brightwater University...oh right* (Edel, PETE student Focus Group Interview, March 2007).

The realization that their pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) is not as comprehensive as they had thought:

Well, they went through what we've done but the problem is we have only done the courses so that we could apply for Greendale University. We did a week of dance, a week of outdoor, a week of athletics. Yes, you were supposed to be able to teach, but I don't know how you learn to teach in two days (Carol, PETE student Focus Group Interview March 2007).

After mid term break I am doing badminton. And I would have done that in college...or in Brightwater University years ago, like I wouldn't have specifically done it [unclear] just as in myself. Again...so I brushed up on that. I have athletics. I have never taught that. I have taught in a club level. But that's completely different than teaching in a school ....in terms. I am doing dancing in....which is...again I wasn't familiar at teaching until last block [unclear]
(Aoife, PETE student Interview, February 2007)

This is borne out by the comments of three cooperating teachers (CT) on PETE student PCK. In the following example there were crucial gaps in basketball PCK and the CT had to step in to correct the situation:

Because of the lack of knowledge...With basketball, Imelda's class last week were doing a lay-up. She was doing one, two, three and up. Anybody who has ever even watched a game of basketball knows that there are two steps for a lay-up. Do you know what I mean? That's the maximum number. Imelda had to interrupt, doing it without the girls knowing and say change the drill; we are reducing the steps to two.
(Louise, Cooperating Teacher, February 2007)

John, another Cooperating Teacher agreed saying he felt that '*their subject knowledge couldn't be great*' (John, Cooperating Teacher, Interview, November, 2006).

In another case the ST created a dangerous teaching situation again due to lack of PCK:

And again, the safety issues. Again with basketball; when she started with basketball, both myself and Imelda were there. She started with something like a 12 against 12 games with one ball. There are 24 balls
(Louise, Cooperating Teacher, February 2007).

This has lead to Louise not wanting this PETE student to teach gymnastics as she does not have confidence in her ability:

I wouldn't be happy with her teaching gymnastics, especially like.... And I just don't think ...just judging by the lack of knowledge,...she doesn't seem to know the basics of backward roll and terms of safety of the neck and all of those types of things. This reinforces that she doesn't have the content knowledge (Louise, Cooperating Teacher, February 2007).

Michael, another CT, felt the same about his ST's gymnastics PCK and remarked:

She's done like a weekend of gymnastics or something and has her

*level zero in gymnastics...I did level zero in GAA and level zero was a complete and utter c**p...you would just turn up. And if you turned up everyone got it. And there were people there I wouldn't put in charge of a cat, not to mention like 20 young fellas* (Michael, Cooperating Teacher, Interview, March 2007).

Three CTs have been vocal about their lack of confidence in PETE student PCK. One of these CTs, Michael, did share his feelings directly with the ST:

It kind of came out that he feels, which I kind of knew he felt that Brightwater University students don't have enough background in the area whereas Greendale University students get six week blocks of badminton and they used to get assessed on badminton whereas we only have little bits here and there and we really are mainly an invasion as well (Carol, PETE Student Interview October 2006).

Three CTs are either unable or unwilling to support PETE students in their PCK learning and so the PETE students turned to reference books and the Internet for this knowledge. This was recognised by one CT during an interview: *I think she is getting them from a book; a lot of theory* (Louise, Cooperating Teacher, Interview December 2006).

In two cases the PETE student senses the negative feelings of the CT:

I just think he is on a pedestal and I am down low and I could never...no...not many people could ever be...like be like him, you know, he knows everything about everything and we are from Brightwater University...we are not good enough to be in this course basically was said to me (Carol, PETE student Interview October 2006)

Effects of Stress on PETE student

Two PETE students feel very isolated and physically manifest the stress they are feeling:

Oh, getting chest pains, anxiousness and before I come in. I can't sleep at night. It probably is got to do with him as well. I am really trying to prove myself to him (Carol, PETE student Interview, November 2006).

They move through feelings of self-doubt in their own abilities:

And you begin to wonder, am I cut out for this. And your self...and your self esteem will collapse under that (Carol, PETE student Interview, November 2006).

As soon as I switched off the recorder, Aoife broke down and cried. She said she was finding it really difficult in there, that she felt totally unsupported and that she was the one driving her own development on TP (Researcher, Reflective Journal, December, 2006).

This PETE student, in spite of feeling this level of stress, manage to draw on

their own strength and resources to alleviate it:

> *Oh, I am very independent now* (Aoife, PETE Student, February, 2006).

Carol did eventually share her feelings with her peers and they were very supportive. Perhaps this is due to knowing each other for the past five years and perhaps having an empathy with her:

> *Well when I broke down one day in front of the girls I told them. But everyone was like stick at it, stick at it. But it was painful enough to stick at it. You could nearly go into a depression if you stuck at it enough you know* (Carol, PETE student Interview, November 2006).

Sometimes a CT will notice the PETE student under duress, but may not act on what he/she has seen:

> *And like the first week she was coming out flustered and it wouldn't be far off a tear like. And you would see that she would have to go for a smoke* (John, Cooperating Teacher Interview November 2006).

Need for facilitator/mediator/counsellor to support PETE students during TP.

The fact that some PETE students are feeling this level of stress may highlight the need for a support mechanism for PETE students. It seemed that, just by virtue of being a 'spare' but interested person, the researcher ended up fulfilling this role:

> *There should be maybe a person like kind of a...a support...That you can go and talk to... I said this already to you like...it was nice to have you as a friendly ear to talk to, an outsider....you know to talk to.* (Carol, PETE student Focus Group Interview, March 2007).

> *There is nobody in the College...who comes around and checks on how we are doing. We don't have any outlet. We are afraid of our lives to say any of this to the tutors. We are all feeling like this and we have no outlet; nobody to share how we are feeling with. Nobody that can actually make a difference, only for being able to talk to you, I don't know what I'd do* (Aoife, PETE student Interview December 2006).

> *I had someone to talk to when you came out. I could ask you openly and honestly about things without fearing your answer* (Edel, Involvement in Research Statement, March 2007)

Quality of Support during TP

From Cooperating Teacher:

Currently, STs are placed in schools following the premise of availability rather than suitability (Fletcher, 1998). In this study this lead to a range in the

quality of CT supervision experiences.

In two cases, there appeared to be quite a nonchalant attitude to PETE student learning progress. This may have been because the CT is untrained for the role of mentor and 'washout effect' (Stroot et al., 1990) occurs thus causing him/her to emulate the mentor that they had themselves on teaching practice:

> *That was the way with mine I think. Like...do you know I'll run over and back. You are fine for the first ten minutes...I am going to go over...I will...I will come back and see how you are, do you know...in a few minutes* (Edel, PETE Student Teacher, Focus Group Interview, March 2007).

Four PETE students were unhappy about this level of support and said:

> *Oh yes, but what I am saying...oh yes, I know what else I was going to say. Like they are getting paid....they are deemed in the class anyway*
>
> *Yes, they should be there. So if they are not teaching a class, can't they not just kind of teach us like...Or just they are not even...they are just looking at us really...* (Carol, PETE student, Interview February 2007)

In addition, the PETE students recognized that the role of the CT in the process should be standardised:

> *They could get a form....a set form like.....and that would be...that could be used for all the schools, do you know. So everyone will be doing the same thing...be assessed on the same thing* (Dara, PETE student, Interview March 2007).

In one case, in spite of the fact that the CT was selected in a random fashion there appeared to be a 'goodness of fit' (Germain & Gitterman, 1987) between the CT and the ST:

> *We kind of think the same, cos when I came in here I thought oh my God this is exactly what I want... She had such a set up in the school ... But she would always...she would always be around and she would always come in. If she had to go away during the class she would always come in...how did you get on there and....like even just as a person like as well, she was so helpful outside....do you know, outside. Like that...like I would call over to her house and stuff ...do you know things...do you know, we just got on really well like* (Dara, PETE Student Interview October 2006)

In two further cases, the STs searched for a substitute CT within the same school, who appeared to have a 'goodness of fit' (Germain & Gitterman, 1987) with their teaching ideals and ambitions:

But he is not the easiest person to talk to. Whereas I would go to Laura first now, before I go to John. She is just…she is really nice and bubbly and very helpful and would go out of her way to help you and everything. Do you know she is just….very easy to talk to as well. (Barbara, PETE Student Interview, February 2007).

She is kind of finished with PE, because she loved when I was taking the classes like. Like she was still…you know, really helpful. But I think once she…once she knew I was fine, she did sit in….sit in on classes and stuff. But do you know it would be like, oh yes, that was great do you know…Whereas Trevor, my other teacher, in the mornings like…the class might have went grand, but then he would…like you know he would fill out a crit and he would pick out things that I could improve on like. Whereas she maybe didn't (Edel, PETE student Interview February 2007).

In addition, when CT feedback became too superficial and repetitive I.e. focusing on classroom management issues rather than pupil learning progression:

Like every class she used to sit down and she would write out an evaluation for me, what went well, what didn't go well. Near the end then I felt that like there was no point in her doing it all the time, so then….I don't know….I was able to…do you know, just take off my own (Dara PETE Student Interview February 2007).

Two began to rely more heavily on their own reflective practice and university tutorials to engage in more 'deep learning' (Marton & Saljo, 1976). In other words they became resourceful and turned into more self-directed learners (Hiemstra, 1994):

When I do reflection it's basically what were the weaknesses in the lesson. Where do you think went wrong and what were the strengths and weaknesses and basically like how would you deal with them next week.. The strengths of the lesson and what went well. Maybe why do you think things worked well or why did things go wrong. So then its like I found some ones would be very detailed and towards the end they were getting lighter because there was one more floor. But now I feel from my 1st year it will be a longer one again. But I think they are really good. As well looking at my co-operating teacher's advice you know on the sheets (Edel, PETE Student Interview, February 2006).

Perhaps in the absence of critical analysis by cooperating teachers of their lessons, the two PETE students began to rely on themselves; on their reflective practice to progress in their learning:

the reflective practice thing works but I don't think everyone is doing it. They mightn't be doing it as detailed. Some people think that it's a

drudge and it is a drudge but after, they really do help. Some people might think they are pointless and even we had a tutorial thing on Friday and after we were talking about the reflective practice. People, you could see, like why are we doing them but I think they are important for you to grow as a teacher, it is important for yourself. Even if you don't have time to write 3 pages, if you just wrote a paragraph on each strength, weaknesses, what can you do next. Then for me I actually try to practice what I have to do for next week. Like say if it was an organisation matter, ok right, I'll do the a,b,c,d thing and more organised and then that works, that worked well then. I suppose you are learning it as you go on (Edel, PETE Student Interview, November, 2006).

From Tutor:

PETE students value the input of tutors and see them as offering a different kind of feedback than CTs; in two cases, more specific expertise:

> *And then I got to speak to her then for about an hour afterwards and there was...I knew she was ...you know, her area was dance like. So there was questions, you know, a couple of things mightn't have been going right in my last dance class. And I wanted her advice. So I was open to asking her everything because I want to learn as much* (Edel, PETE Student Interview, March 2007).

The STs seem to value the notion of the Tutor getting to know the person-pedagogue, giving a more holistic dimension to the assessment process:

> *Sinead gave us loads of time you know, got to know us....before she ever went out like, do you know...I thought that was excellent. She gave so much time and got to know you as a person as well* (Aoife, PETE student interview, December 2006).

This may be related to the fact that tutors have power in the process as they currently grade the student, therefore, the student must do a reconnaissance mission to find out what they are looking for so they can meet each tutor's expectations (cloning?). Four PETE students seemed to value having Tutors from PE and from Education:

> *Yes and they give good lengthy time after a session which I really appreciated. Both of them came to two different classes. One went to a PE and one went to an SPHE class. It was interesting in that sense. So one could tell me very much about my teaching manner and my relationship with the kids which the other one didn't focus on. She was saying my PE side was very much about the learning in the class all through the physical activity. So I got the best of both worlds, I thought.* (Aoife, PETE Student Interview February 2007).

In this instance the Tutor agreed with the sentiment of the ST:

> *But the notion of the two tutors, tutors coming from different areas. I*

> *think that gives such a richness. And I think that...it's a pity again, that's something that we kind of do under pressure. And you know...I mean because we have had some tremendous conversations I think about students. And I have...I have learned an awful lot, you know, from it* (Sinead, Tutor Focus Group Interview, January 2007).

In all cases, however, STs felt that the Tutors were not listening to their point of view during the assessment process:

> *Even though they let you bring your ideas on board, they don't really want them. Do you know, I really notice that one or two of them; you are nearly frightened to say anything because there is no right or wrong way to do something but their way, I think, is the right way? Do you know?* (Carol, PETE Student Focus Group Interview March 2007).

Tutor Role in Teaching Practice

Tutors themselves feel that it is difficult to judge teaching performance when they see PETE Students sporadically during teaching practice:

> *Tutors who visit a school 4 times over a period of 10 weeks cannot have a clear insight into the abilities of the student teacher* (Claire, Tutor Focus Group Interview, January 2007).

Perhaps to counteract this Tutors expressed the idea that the expertise of cooperating teachers must be harnessed in TP in order to fully capture the learning progression of the PETE student. Currently, Some tutors invite the CT to give feedback on PETE student progress:

> *Before we go do you what to throw in your bits and we can add that to the pile* (Liz, Tutor Interview October 2007).

However, in order to truly capture CT expertise, Tutors would welcome a more formal training programme for CTs to standardise their input on TP:

> *I think the training should be both for the teachers in the schools as well as the tutors who do this work. I think it should be seen as both a professional development initiative for those persons themselves as well as an accountability mechanism for the teacher education programme* (Claire, Tutor Focus Group Interview, January 2007).

It seems that CTs equally recognize the importance of their input and do value an opportunity to share their views with Tutors on PETE student progress:

> *It was good...because I think for...for...any other reason it's just that...you know, if things...if she had made a mess of the class....you know, not that it was going to happen. But at least you know if myself and the other PE teachers were there, you could say, well look she has done so much now, and she has been fantastic* (Joan, Cooperating Teacher Interview, March 2007)

From Peers

Carol did eventually share her feelings with her peers and they were very supportive. Perhaps this is due to knowing each other for the past five years and having an empathy with Carol:

> *Well when I broke down one day in front of the girls I told them. But everyone was like stick at it, stick at it. But it was painful enough to stick at it. You could nearly go into a depression if you stuck at it enough you know* (Carol, PETE Student Interview November 2006).

From the School

When Principals were asked about having an Induction programme for student teachers, one Principal said:

> *I am not so sure we have anything written down. No...but like they would be included as a normal part of subject meetings. You know, they wouldn't be excluded that way. There is no...[cough] excuse me. There is no separate room or anything like that for them. They are up in the staff room where they are with everybody* (Mr. Kelly, Principal Interview, March 2007).

Another Principal had a member of staff assigned to this role:

> *She is really in charge of any of the people that come in for instance on teaching practice, people that would be involved in language assistance, people that would come into the school. She would be actually...she is a very personable, nice girl. But she is also...you know, she is a special duties teacher, so she has a post in that regard. But I find it is good to have some kind of nice friendly face, someone that they can come back to* (Mr. Cotter, Principal Interview, March 2007)

It appears that Induction for student teachers does not seem to be standardised across schools, which implies that PETE students receive differing levels of support on teaching practice. In the instance where a school has no support mechanism for the PETE student:

> *We had one meeting since I started here, you know, with all the HDips and that was it* (Aoife, PETE Student Interview, October, 2006).

The PETE student may feel isolated:

> *I kind of sneak off. Nobody even knows I exist* (Carol, PETE student, February, 2007).

The evidence from two cases is that such isolation contributed to high levels of stress for the PETE student.

Current Role of the school on Teaching Practice

Principals appear generally quite unhappy about the relationship between schools and the university. They feel used:

> *In fact the school is quite peripheral to the whole affair. It is kind of like*

as if you are...you are...you are really just...there is a certain desperation I often feel about getting people into places, whether they fit or they don't fit (Mr. Noonan, Principal Interview March 2007).

They feel that they are taken for granted:

But I have to say that if there was more of a professional approach to how they dealt with schools, I think schools would respond professionally (Mr. Clancy, Principal Interview March 2007).

They also think that the TP process is very haphazard:

And it's a little bit ad hoc (Mr. Clancy, Principal March 2007).

One example of this is that schools are not informed about the PETE student assigned to their school in advance and therefore have little time to prepare for their arrival. Principals spoke at length about the type of teacher they wished to employ and felt that if they knew something about the PETE student in advance they might be able to harness their potential at an early stage and groom them towards employment:

All that happens is that we get....we are told really that...that this is the name of the person that is coming and this is their subject. And you know you feel like you are being taking a little bit for granted, you know. Like for instance if it was the co-operative office for industry we would have a chance to interview (Mr. Noonan, Principal Interview March 2007).

Principals feel excluded in the grading process and believe that the school needs to work closely with the university when grading the PETE student:

I think a teacher needs to know what you are looking for as well. But I do think...why not...should...why not...the...the tutor and the teacher sit down in the evaluation of the student. Because our teacher is always free when a tutor comes. So why isn't there some collaboration on a formal basis, rather ...it happens informally, why isn't that made formal. Right. I think the other side is, what is...year heads should be brought into that as well. Because year heads have a lot of information, perhaps myself and the principal as well, that there should be some kind of a formal basis, that we would feed back into that as well (Mr. O'Brien, Principal, Interview March 2007).

Finally they feel that they should be included in the preparation of the PETE students in the university:

I honestly think ....and I don't know whether it is even happening...maybe it does happen. But I wonder in teacher education, is there any involvement of principals at all, or administration in schools, do they have any inputs? (Mr. Noonan, Principal March 2007).

Grad Dip Course Content

PETE students identified areas where content overlapped in PE and

Education:

> *And then there is another education module and I find that a lot of stuff that they do, we've already repeated in another...Even in our first week. In our first week we did aims and objectives. We did everything and then we had to sit through about 4 lectures of the same stuff* (Barbara, PETE student Focus Group March 2007).
>
> *For the first three weeks we were taught how to do lesson plans and schemes of work in...I would say, about four different subjects. And they were all taught differently* (Edel, PETE student Focus Group March 2007).

They valued opportunities to peer teach but at times thought that more applied scenarios might work better:

> *When you are...when we are teaching our class, when we are peer teaching, everyone is great, and everybody can do everything. But realistically in a class most people can't do the forward roll and you know most people...you know, like there should be different scenarios and do you know if people are bold ...like get someone to be bold in the class and how would you deal with it...Do you know the way the primary school is up there...they should bring in the kids while...while the lecturers are here with us, let us do the class and then get feedback from that* (Carol, PETE student Focus Group March 2007).

They also felt that perhaps peer learning opportunites were exhausted as they had been studying for 5 years together prior to entry to the programme:

> *That it was very difficult to learn new things when you come into a course with 16 people that have already been on your course and that you've been with for the last five years* (Edel, PETE student Focus Group, March 2007).

Challenges for the Future:

- Role of the CT on TP
- Training of the CT
- Role of the Principal on TP
- Controlling TP Placement, liaising closely with schools
- Building on Prior PCK of PETE students
- Support system for PETE students

References

Barab, S.A, & Duffy, T.M., (2000) *From Practice Fields to Communities of Practice*. In Jonassen, D.H., Land, S.M. (Eds) Theoretical Foundations of Learning Environments. Mahwah, N.J. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates

Blackburn, R.T., Chapman, D.W., & Cameron, S.W., (1981) Cloning in Academe: Mentorship and Academic Careers. In Sands, R.G., Parson, L.A. & Duane, J., (1991) Faculty Mentoring Faculty in a Public University, *Journal of Higher Education 62(2), 176-193*

Brouwer, N., & Korthagen, F. (2005). Can teacher education make a difference? *American Educational Research Journal*, 42, 153-224.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2005), 2005 Presidential Address The New Teacher Education: for better for worse, *Educational Researcher* 34 (7) pp3-17

Constantine, D., (1999) Findings the words: Translation and survival of the human. In Clarke, C.M., (2001) Ed., Talking Shop: Authentic Conversation and Teacher Learning, New York: Teachers College Press

Cooper, J.E (1991) Tell our own stories: The reading and writing of journals and diaries. In Oliver, K.L & Lalik, R., (2000), Bodily Knowledge: Learning about equity and justice with adolescent girls. New York: Lang

Fenwick,T.(1999) *Classifying Alternate Perspectives in Experiential Learning.* AERC www.edst.educ.ubc.ca/aerc/1999/99fenwick.htm (accessed 7/11/05 at 19:00)

Fletcher, S.J. (1998). 'Attaining Self-Actualization Through Mentoring' *European Journal of Teacher Education, 21 (21) pp. 109- 118*

Hiemstra, R. (1994). Self-directed learning. In T. Husen & T. N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Education* (second edition), Oxford: Pergamon Press

Lave J., & Wenger, E., (1991), *Situated Learning and Legitimate Peripheral Participation*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Press

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G.B., (1999), Designing Qualitative Research, London:Sage

Marton, F. & Säljö, R., (1976) On qualitative differences in learning. I – outcome and process, *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 46, pp. 4-11.*

Mawer, M. (Ed) (1996) *Mentoring in Physical Education: Issues and insights.* UK:Falmer Press

Morgan, D.L., (1997), Focus Groups as qualitative research. Newbury Park, California:Sage

Oliver, K.L & Lalik, R., (2000), Bodily Knowledge: Learning about equity and justice with adolescent girls. New York: Lang

Putnam, R. (2000). In Smith, M. K. (2005) *'Robert Putnam'*, the encyclopaedia of informal education ,www.infed.org/thinkers/putnam.htm (accessed on 19/11/05 @13:01)

Richardson, L, (2000), Writing: A Method of Inquiry. In Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (Eds) Handbook of Qualitative Research, London:Sage

Rossman, G.B., & Rallis, S.F., (1998), Learning in the field: An introduction to qualitative research. In Azzarito, L., & Ennis C.D., (2003), A Sense of Connection: Toward Social Constructivist Physical Education, Sport, Education and Society, Vol 8, No. 2, pp 179-198

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J., (1998), Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for developing grounded theory. London:Sage

Stroot, S., Keil, V., Stedman, P., Lohr, L., Faust, R., Schincariol-Randall, L., Sullivan, A., Czerniak, G., Kuchcinski, J., Orel, N., & Richter, M. (1998). Peer assistance and review guidebook. Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Education. On http://education.utoledo.edu/par/Needs.html accessed on 14/11/06 at 9.54pm

Tomlinson, P.D. (1989) Having it both ways: hierarchial focusing as a research interview method. In Hobson, A.J., (2003) Student Teachers' Conceptions and Evaluations of 'Theory' in Initial Teacher Training (ITT) Mentoring and Tutoring Vol. 11, No. 3 pp 245-261